The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

We hope every Congregational Church will take its part in the "Inner Mission" to which the denomination has set itself. Judgment must first begin at the House of God. If we could only make Congregational Churches what they are supposed to be, there would be no doubt about the contribution they could make to the world at the present time, and no doubt about the revival of true religion they would bring. We trust that not only ministers but people in the pew will read the literature which has just been published in regard to the "Inner Mission". Inquiries should be addressed to the Independent Press. But it is with ministers and deacons that the revival will begin. When R. F. Horton was at the height of his fame he went one Sunday in the Isle of Man to a Primitive Methodist Church, where a joiner, by name Stowell, "preached so *really* on 'Knowing God' " that Horton went to a second service, when the preacher's text was "To Live is Christ". Horton wrote in his diary:

> It was a beautiful experience, and taught me how necessary it is that preaching should be (1) from the standpoint of the hearers' lives, (2) wrought in the speaker's own life. From fulfilling these conditions these two addresses, badly delivered and without pretence of form or construction, were far better than any sermons I have been able to preach, *i.e.*, on a higher level in God's sight. May He teach me to do better".

In that spirit the "Inner Mission" will succeed.

* * *

Earlier in the year we commended Dr. L. P. Jacks's proposals for an International Fund to secure world peace. Those proposals he makes more definite in an article in the July *Hibbert Journal* under the title "A Demilitarised League of Nations". Dr. Jacks argues that

> in the present state of international morality there is no infallible method of preventing war,

and that

> all treaties, compacts, or covenants to suppress war by a general combination of armed force endure only so long as their application is not needed and are certain to collapse in the day of performance.

No future Covenant is likely to have any better results than the

present one, and the League must therefore cease to be a league of armed nations and should aim at the creation of positive co-operation, making

> no higher demand . . . on the altruism of sovereign political states than is customary in business transactions or contracts intended for the mutual benefit of the contracting parties.

As there is no assurance that an international *force* would even be effective, there should instead be an international *fund*. To this nations should contribute each year 10% of their armament expenditure: this would be a definite contribution to benefit collective security, a guarantee fund serving as security for peaceable behaviour. Armament expenditure would thus be immediately reduced by 10%, and the annual contributions at present would equal £150,000,000. This Fund would be administered by international Trustees, and would be used for international purposes, to solve the problem of "poverty in plenty" by merchandizing and distributing surplus commodities and raw materials. Dr. Jacks no doubt realizes that the scheme bristles with difficulties, but he claims that it will give the world a new start, and by creating a common interest and fostering positive co-operation turn the faces of the nations towards the light.

* * *

1936 has been a year in which sport has had a prominent place in the thoughts of many people. The Olympic Games in Berlin have reminded us how sport has spread to the continent of Europe in a way which would have been deemed impossible a generation ago. And not only Europe! Indian papers just received show the great appeal football is making in the Dominion. We scarcely think that anything parallel to a scene described in the Indian newspapers would be possible in this country. Two Calcutta teams were left in the final of the India Football Association Tournament, the Mahommedan and the European Civil. After two draws on consecutive days the Mahommedan team won by 2 goals to 1, and then

> Muslims irrespective of age or class were literally delirious with joy. Immediately after the referee's whistle indicated the close of the game, Maulvi Fazlul Haq, ex-Mayor, led a mass prayer in the centre of the play-ground in token of thankfulness to merciful providence for this singular luck to Mahommedan Sporting Club.

A scene like that seems incredible to us in this country, though we believe that fervent prayers are offered for success in football pools. Many there be, indeed, in every land who would make religion a tool. Dr. Ambedkar seems to be one of the greatest exponents of this conception of religion; he is estimating the political value of all the religions of India in order to decide with which one

the Depressed Classes he leads should throw in their lot—Islam, Christianity, Sikhism. This is only another version of the mob-religion of Germany, Italy, and Russia.

* * *

We do not think anything is gained by minimizing the effectiveness of the brewers' propaganda. The trade has great resources, and it is able to utilize the best brains and the best advertisers and artists.

The power of the vested interests is well seen in an endeavour which was made recently to secure temperance advertizing on the trams and buses of the London Passenger Transport Board. With a well-known brewers' advertisement in mind, the following was prepared and submitted to the Board's publicity department for insertion on the buses at the usual trade rates :—

A WORD TO THE WISE.

If you can say, as well you may,
"Strong Drink is a Deceiver,"
In spite of all the trade may say,
You'll stay an unbeliever.

NO DRIVER IS SAFE WHO DRINKS.

The advertisement was declined on the ground that posters of a controversial nature are not accepted. An advertiser can praise his own product, but must not make a statement derogatory to any other product : you can say "Beer is Best" or "Memorial Hall Lemonade is Best" or "Water Bright is the Finest Drink", but you must not say "Memorial Hall Lemonade is better than Somebody's Stout", or "Water Gives Health, Beer Undermines Health". We wonder whether if it proved possible to get past this barrier a temperance advertisement would then be accepted. One firm of brewers is said to spend £50,000 a year on advertising in London's buses and trams. So quite naturally the L.P.T.B. gives first consideration to its best customers. If the power of the vested interests makes temperance advertizing difficult there is all the more need for the exercise of ingenuity and for personal service. The Churches, especially, must not allow a campaign which aims at making drinkers of the young to have a successful issue.

* * *

If the Commandments are applicable to denominations as well as to individuals we fear that we break them continually, for we certainly covet for Congregationalism a publishing house like the S.P.C.K. The Methodists show in the Epworth Press an enterprise which puts both the Baptists and Congregationalists to shame, but even they cannot compare with the range and quality of the S.P.C.K.'s publications. Whether it be due to the long-established tradition, accumulated resources, or the skilled leadership of Dr. Lowther Clarke, or

to the three together, the Society continues to pour forth volumes of sound learning, large and small, as well as to popularize the work of scholars. Gore's *Commentary* and *Essays Catholic and Critical* are but the most conspicuous examples of an output during the last decade of which any publishing house could be proud. Among other books from the press on our table this quarter is Miss Gwendolen Stephenson's *Edward Stuart Talbot* (10s. 6d.), a worthy life of a Bishop held in high regard by Nonconformists as well as Anglicans, Dr. C. S. Phillips's *The Church in France, 1848-1907* (12s. 6d.) published for the Church Historical Society, a continuation of the writer's *The Church in France, 1789-1848,* which deserved the warm welcome it received from students. Then there are two slighter works, but in their way not less important, for they are packed with material—Dr. Lowther Clarke's own handbook on *Almsgiving* (2s. and 1s.), a valuable historical summary *plus* practical considerations, and Prof. C. F. Rogers's *The Case for Miracles* (2s.) which is on the lines of the writer's volumes on *Questions in Hyde Park* which have been commended in these pages. But why, oh, why, does Prof. Rogers disfigure his pages and torpedo his arguments by such paragraphs as this?

> But German scholarship is not so conspicuous for sound judgment. True, one scholar generally criticizes another and points out his mistakes, but more than that is needed. Before the war Germany had a mass of correct, detailed information about things in England. The events proved that her judgment was not equal to her knowledge and that she entirely misunderstood the English people. In Theology especially you must have insight as well as knowledge, and insight comes from training. The German Liberal Protestant theologians were for the most part trained in a Christianity that had no succession of bishops and had lost its continuity with the past, and in consequence also, to a great extent, lost its belief in the Sacraments. With the loss of Sacraments had gone the loss of the sense of worship, and with the loss of Sacraments and worship had gone the belief in the Incarnation and the power to judge of Christ.

Are the Friends any less faithful disciples of our Lord than the most devout believer in Sacraments?

Still another S.P.C.K. volume is Dr. E. G. Selwyn's *Thoughts on Worship and Prayer* (3s. 6d.). The early pages of this book are fine and searching, and will help readers of all Communions. Then, on p. 41, some will find a check, for Dr. Selwyn says:

> It is not, therefore, an accident that those parts of the Church which have lost the Apostolic ministry are precisely those which, as their own leaders frankly admit, have also largely lost the vital art of worship. For Christian worship is too closely bound up with belief in the divine Christ and the divine Church for it to be dissociated from either of these without serious loss.

Now what does this mean? Ignoring altogether Free Churchmen who seem to be happy only when fouling their own nest, who are the Free Churchmen—leaders or followers—who frankly admit the loss of "the vital art of worship"? That Free Church worship often fails to realize its ideal, Free Churchmen frankly recognize with penitence and shame; but those who still often feel their hearts burn within them as they join in praise and prayer in the sanctuary would be traitors indeed did they not gladly testify to the fact. Worship, with free prayers or ordered forms, with bishops and priests or without, can be—and, sad to say, often is—arid and barren, and the more sincere and devout men are in all the Churches the more do they deplore the fact. But Dr. Selwyn spoils a very valuable and suggestive book when he implies that worship in the churches without episcopal ordination of priests, *etc.* is *ipso facto* less real and sincere than that in, say, Anglo-Catholic churches. It simply is not true. That said, we hope that Free Churchmen will read a study from which they will learn much.

We suggest to the Free Churches that they should see what they can learn from the Anglican publishing house. It may be that it will occur to somebody that one publishing house for all the Free Churches might be useful, but there is about as much prospect of that as of reunion with Rome—or with the Baptists! When we can't get even the two Congregational Publication Departments united, what hope is there of getting those of all the Free Churches? Some people might lose their jobs, and a *Free Church Hymn Book* might even be suggested, to the dismay of those denominations whose finances are based on their hymnbook sales. And the Cromwell or Milton Press, or whatever we call it, might publish books which now go to the trade publishers, who are always losing money and leaving large fortunes.

Let us cease talking about reunion until we unite where union is possible; and the Epworth, Kingsgate, Carey, and Independent Presses are a good place to begin, after the Livingstone and Independent Presses have become one. If only we had faith enough!

* * *

On Sunday evening, August 9th, an Editor had done a hard day's duty, and there was work waiting to keep him to the small hours. But there was just time to "listen in to the news", and having heard the dozen names selected for the English team for Australia, he felt he must write something or burst. And here it is:

> First there is the captain. I looked in vain in the cricket averages in the day's *Observer*, but did not find the name G. O. Allen there in the batting or bowling. I looked back over my *Wisdens* to see what experience in captaincy G. O. Allen has had, but I did not find any. I have always understood that it is extremely unwise to have a fast bowler as captain; apparently

there is something in G. O. Allen's personality, career, or knowledge which outweighs this handicap. What is it, the world wonders? He has performed one or two good feats with the bat and more with the ball, though his analysis during the Lord's Test Match was flattered by the woeful batting of the Indians; the marvellous agility of Duckworth rightly indicated that a stronger batting side would have made havoc of the erratic stuff he sent down.

> What are his qualifications? One,
> He's the Earl of Fitzdotterel's eldest son.

G. O. Allen is an amateur player, plays for Middlesex, and is on the Committee of the M.C.C. And so we must be loyal to our captain! If Bradman has one-tenth the cricket sense of Woodful we are almost beaten from the start.

There followed some comments on the team of such a character that a proof-reader (a Southerner) thinks they ought to be omitted! They included remarks on the fact that Middlesex contributes as many members to the team as Lancashire and Yorkshire combined, and more than Derbyshire, and on the M.C.C.'s partiality for Southern amateurs, and they continued [Holmes subsequently withdrew]:

Does anyone believe that Holmes would be in the team were he, say, a Leicester professional? . . . We are sending out to Australia a team which lacks the best fieldsman in England (Mitchell), the best fast bowler in England (Bowes), and the best two fast-medium opening bowlers (Larwood and Smailes). If these four had played for Middlesex they would have been among the first selections. Had they been Middlesex amateurs they would have been selected twice!

Fortunately in Robins, Hammond, Leyland, Verity, Fishlock, Hardstaff, Duckworth, Voce, Worthington, Barnett we have what will provide the backbone of a team that will not let us down altogether—and maybe will carry the rest. Let us hope so. Had they all been the Allen-Farnes-Holmes variety, like the Chaplain of the House of Commons I should have looked round at the members and then prayed for my country. And I tremble to think what Bradman may do when they bowl.

* * *

And if there is still snobbery on the sports field—if Larwood may be accused of body-line bowling but it must not be so much as mentioned in the same breath as an amateur's name—the same vile thing is to be found elsewhere. Try to discover the reasons which govern the votes of the flappers and the flappers *plus* in London offices. They do not talk about "the dear Queen" as did Victorian old ladies, but they have exactly the same values. At an age when they might be expected to be on the side of the bottom dog, and sensitive to the needs of the poor and oppressed, they are hidebound with convention and respectability. Royal Princesses and Abbey weddings appeal to

them far more than the needs of slum children. "Oh, no, we couldn't possibly vote anything but National", their attitude proclaims, "think of that awful Mr. ——, and all the dirty East End people who vote Labour. We couldn't possibly be mixed up with those". These are the folk who dwell in the Home Counties and look on all who dwell in the north of England as benighted and uncouth savages, and as for depressed areas . . . . . !

They are not all like that, God be thanked. Yesterday we saw a sight that rejoiced even the hard editorial heart. A youth, evidently a motor mechanic or something of the kind, stepped from a bus; he was in working clothes, and his hands and face were greasy and dirty. As he alighted a girl clad in a light summer frock met him and took his arm, and off they went, a picture of perfect happiness and content. *O si sic omnes*! But the average city stenographer feels that manual labour is *infra dig.*, and that those who are engaged in it belong to the lower orders.

If there is one place where snobbery should never be found it is the Christian Church. Are we satisfied it is for ever banished? Does the poor man count for as much in churches of every denomination—in Congregational churches—as the rich? Do churches judge a preacher on his merits irrespective of the College in which he was trained? Do candidates from the real public schools get admission to colleges as easily as those from the so-called public schools? Not long ago a minister, not a Congregationalist we are glad to say, called on a suburban resident to get support for his work. He was congratulated on the proximity of his chapel to the working-class part of the suburb, and on the fact that the Sunday School would serve the children of that area. He replied, "Of course, we're not particularly anxious to have those children. If they were to come in any numbers, our own children would stay away". Would the Carpenter who was a carpenter's Son be welcome we wonder? And until the churches have eradicated every trace of this insidious evil can they expect to win men for their Lord?

* * *

THE death of Dr. S. Parkes Cadman came with a great shock to his many friends in this country—friends of many years and in all the churches. Perhaps the most typical Anglo-American of our times, he retained many British characteristics while he acquired American ones. He was indeed a remarkable combination from whatever point of view he was regarded. He was Methodist in his enthusiasm, Congregational in his cultural background. We were startled when preaching for him in the Central Church, Brooklyn to hear his frequent interjections from the dais of "Hallelujah" and "Praise the Lord"—after the manner common to the Methodists before they became respectable; and on the same occasion exceedingly embarrassed by his American eulogy of the sermon, in which he spoke of John

Peel the huntsman, and the preacher as a "mighty hunter before the Lord". And if American and English, Methodist and Congregationalist, were fused in Cadman, so were the gifts of the scholar and the "popularizer". His sermons and his writings were so rich in language and allusion that sometimes they became rotund and florid, but at the same time he could answer questions pithily and with great effect and readiness. In the United States some years ago we heard many times the story of the dinner party when a prize was offered for the best impromptu fairy tale. The competitors with one consent agreed that the prize should go to the one whose story began, "Once upon a time somebody asked Dr. S. Parkes Cadman a question, and he replied 'I don't know' "! Turning over the other day a volume of his replies to questions, syndicated in newspapers throughout the continent (there were many thousands of letters still awaiting reply), we were struck by their thoroughness, their commonsense, and their sympathy. As a radio preacher and answerer of questions he was unsurpassed. Of the remarkable experiences broadcasting brought him he would often tell. Two we remember vividly. Entering one day a church where he was to preach he noticed a young lady in tears. To an inquiry whether he could help he was told that the lady wanted to speak to Dr. Cadman, and when he disclosed his identity, learnt that her *fiancé* was dying in hospital after an accident, and was continually crying out for "Dr. Cadman", whom he did not know, but whose voice he was accustomed to hear. Cadman went at once to the hospital, and the sound of the familiar voice brought peace.

One night far from civilization his car broke down. He waited for some time until another car came along, and when he hailed it in the dark got the reply: "We'll be with you right now, Dr. Cadman. We recognize your voice".

It is sad to think that voice, with the inspiration and comfort it brought to many, will be heard no more, that English Congregationalists at Carrs Lane and elsewhere will never again marvel at the opulence of his thought and language, and the fervour of his faith. We think of him as a gracious host in his own land, a good companion in a boat on the Lake of Geneva, a stimulating friend. It is perhaps fitting that one of the last things he wrote should be about an Englishman, an appreciation of Rudyard Kipling, in the Summer Number of *Religion and Life*.

* * *

A College Principal writes to suggest that the word "some" should be prefixed to a sentence in the Editorial of the last issue about "Principals and Professors who proclaim the benefits of episcopacy *etc.*" We quite agree. We thought all our readers would "understand" *some*, knowing our Principals and Professors as they do.

* * *

When the new Yale Lectures on Preaching are published on this side of the Atlantic we shall no doubt have more to say about them. Meanwhile we must quote one sentence from the American edition. The Lectures are by Dr. J. Edgar Park, at one time our American correspondent. He quotes a ministerial son of the Manse saying to his father:

> The difference between the congregation you used to have and mine is this—if any member of your parish was absent from church there was a reason; if any member of my parish is present at church, there is a reason.

Which says a good deal in very little space.

* * *

That versatile person Commander Stephen King-Hall, who contributes to our present issue, is responsible for a new enterprise. Not satisfied with writing plays, directing an Insurance Company, travelling about the world, writing on international affairs, and broadcasting regularly, Commander King-Hall now proposes to write to all who desire it a weekly News-Letter. In these letters he comments about the world with that breadth of view and understanding outlook which have come to be associated with him. Probably no man to-day exercises more influence on the young people of this country than Commander King-Hall, and we hope older people as well as those who have been accustomed to listen to his talks to children will back this new project. For 10s., sent to 27, Cresswell Place, London, S.W.10, the News-Letter will be dispatched week by week for a year. We have seen the first nine and we do not wonder that over a thousand people are already taking the letters.

* * *

"T.P." saw from his window one of his boys at Durnford apparently using a catapult. He shouted for him, and said "What were you doing?" "Please, sir, I was just shooting *very gently* at one of your ducks".

* * *

KOHELETH AND THE MODERN MOOD.

By Principal E. J. Price, M.A., B.D.

The book that bears the title *Ecclesiastes* in our English versions is often a source of perplexity to pious Christians. Its pessimistic outlook, its failure to discover any meaning or purpose in life, its chilling view of God, and its unawareness of all that makes for joy and peace in believing, shock their deepest feelings and make them wonder why such a book should be included in Scripture at all. Apart from a few maxims and soaring phrases here and there that are usually understood in a very different sense from that intended by the writer, the book as a whole remains unread even by fairly conscientious students of the Bible, and there are probably very few preachers who seek in its pages guiding thoughts for discourse. From a religious point of view it manifestly stands upon a lower plane than even the most primitive of the Old Testament documents, which, with all their crudity, display at least a profound sense of the nearness of God and of His manifold implication in the life of men. How often does one hear it said that it is a grave loss to religion that *Ecclesiastes* should be included in the canon while *Ecclesiasticus*, so like it in name, and so different in outlook, should be excluded.

No doubt the inclusion of *Koheleth* in the sacred writings was due in no small degree to the patent subterfuge whereby the writer sought to shelter himself under the great name of Solomon—a claim which he forgets, by the way, almost as soon as he makes it, so that the book as a whole is put forth upon the authority of his own anonymity. The title he gives himself, *Koheleth*, is intriguing and had led to a good deal of discussion. It is clearly intended to convey, however, that the writer would have his readers understand that he claims a special personal authority that makes his words worthy of attention. Whether we understand the title in the sense of "Preacher", "Teacher", "Lecturer", "Professor", "Convener of an Assembly", or assiduous "Collector of wise sayings", it is meant to suggest that the writer has a claim to be heard because he knows what he is talking about, having had special experience in many important spheres of life.

The book itself, apart from the writer, presents some perplexities. (1) Passages of sustained argument are interspersed with pious reflections and gnomic maxims. (2) The point of view is by no means consistent throughout; while the main argument suggests a gloomy pessimism which seems to point sometimes in the direction of atheism, *Koheleth* manifestly believes in God after a fashion of his own, and again and again lays it down that the way of wisdom consists in obedience to the divine commandments. More striking still are certain passages on the fear of God and divine judgment for sin,

which break in with startling abruptness, and suggest a mood of pious assurance for which there is no basis in the writer's premisses. "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity" is the main theme, announced both at the beginning and at the end. Yet here and there the fear of God is conceived in such a way as to suggest that "vanity and striving after wind" are by no means the last words in respect of man's life on earth.

Various attempts have been made to obviate these inconsistencies. It has been suggested that the book is really a dialogue between a teacher and his pupil, or between representatives respectively of higher and lower religious views, or between "Two Voices" in one and the same man, whose attitude of mind wavers uncertainly between faith and despair. But there is nothing in the form of the book to suggest a dialogue, nor are the statements on either side modified by the sort of qualifications we should expect in the case of a man who was influenced in contrary directions and could not make up his mind where the truth lay. There can be no reasonable doubt that some at least of the more startling contrasts are due to orthodox interpolations on the part of a pious editor who recognized the menace to religion contained in a book like this, which carried the authority of Solomon while presenting only one side, and that the less worthy side, of the great master's reflections upon life.

At the same time, it would seem to be worth while to put in a caveat against carrying theories of interpolation too far. The canon of complete consistency makes demands which ignore the weakness of human nature. How many modern authors could triumphantly sustain the test? How many preachers could successfully defend themselves against the charge of inconsistency brought by an inconvenient super-hearer who could remember everything they had ever said? If a minor prophet denounces judgment in sweeping and unqualified terms so as to make sure that his word shall be winged and effective, is he never to be allowed to speak a word of hope and of renewal? And does our experience of other Oriental writings, such as the Indian Upanishads, justify us in the assumption that Eastern authors will always display the lucidity and logical coherence characteristic of the French?

Exaggerated theories of interpolation do not make sufficient allowance for changing moods and for an attitude of mind which, while obsessed by the problems which seem to deny the implication of God in human affairs, yet clings, almost despairingly, to an attenuated faith. It is not impossible that what we have before us is not so much a single work composed in accordance with a definite plan, as a selection of jottings from a note-book, in which ideas and arguments are set down at different times and under the influence of passing moods. If so, *Koheleth* belongs to the literature of Confession, and may be described as the scattered musings of one who

finds it difficult, though not altogether impossible, to retain his belief in a personal Divine Providence in face of an honest and candid contemplation of the stark problems of life. He confronts the worst things that can be said about life, its purposelessness, its emptiness, its unsolved riddles, nay, he even heightens and exaggerates these things, and yet tries to find some room for faith in God. From time to time his survey of life induces a mood of the greyest pessimism; but on the whole his inner instincts rebel against it.

What concerns us here, however, is not any critical analysis of the book, but its value to us to-day as an expression of certain attitudes of mind which are wide-spread among the people with whom we have to do, and which constitute a direct challenge to our Christian faith. It might be said, with some truth, that *Ecclesiastes* is the most modern book in the Bible, and that unless we are able in some sense to come to terms with it, we have no convincing message for the modern world. *Koheleth* represents a reaction against the shallow orthodoxy that refuses to look facts in the face; and it is significant that many of our contemporaries find it difficult to square their experience of life with the affirmations of religion. To them, as to *Koheleth,* futility seems to be the last word in all human effort and aspiration, and there is no sign anywhere that God really cares. The traditional consolations of religion awaken no response in the hearts of men embittered and tormented by the sense of their utter incapacity to get anything worth while out of life.

Koheleth, indeed, is better off than his modern representatives in that he does think that in spite of the futility of effort, he can get something worth while out of life. His fundamental thought is that life offers us no real or permanent satisfaction; with his best effort man can find no meaning or purpose in it ("All is vanity and a striving after wind"); and the only wise thing he can do is to turn his back deliberately upon all attempts to solve the riddle of existence, and to take thankfully, as gifts of God, such good things as time and opportunity present to him. Nevertheless *Koheleth* is no mere sensualist. As Dr. Peake reminds us:

> From gross indulgence he would have turned with disgust; it was madness, and no man who valued his peace of mind would be enticed by it. . . He urges, rather, a moderate enjoyment of the good things of life. . . Life is a bad business at the best, but it lies within our power to palliate its misery by prudence, and the due enjoyment of what little pleasure we can get. And we should be all the more eager to make the most of our opportunities for pleasure in that in the dreary darkness of Sheol no possibility of enjoyment will be found. His motto is *Carpe Diem,* and if in the abstract it be not a high motto, we must remember the misery of his time, and the absence of any hope of improvement in this world or immortality in the next. . . If we ask the cause of this misery and of the general vanity of life

and uselessness of all endeavour, it lies in the conditions of human life.

God has a plan of the world, everything has its time and season; *i.e.*, every event has its pre-ordained date, and nothing we can do can hasten or retard it; the part of wisdom is to be on the alert in order to get the utmost profit out of events when they do turn up. But man cannot find out what this plan is. Hence life must often seem to be ruled by chance, rather than by law. In any case man is not master of his own fate. The conditions of life have been ordained for him by God, and it is futile and foolish to struggle against inscrutable power. It is significant that while *Koheleth* frequently brings in the name of God, his deity is withdrawn from the life of man ("God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth"); He is to be feared rather than trusted and loved; man must be very circumspect in his approaches to Him, for God "hath no pleasure in fools", and if provoked to anger may destroy the work of His hands. The fact is, to quote Peake again, that:

> *Koheleth's* conception of God has nothing attractive or winning. He is rather set before us as the omnipotent Ruler who has ordained all the course of history, which man vainly seeks to comprehend, and as the austere Deity on whose favour or forbearance none may venture to presume. Such enjoyment as may be gained from life in harmony with His Laws is legitimate [because] it is His Gift.

It is clear that *Koheleth* knows nothing of that vital belief in a personal God which inspired the earlier prophets. He takes his stand upon a colourless monotheism which seems almost irrelevant to the tasks and hopes of life. It would have made little radical difference to his outlook, except to make it more consistent, if he had sought a solution to his problem in the view that the world is just the plaything of blind chance. His theism appears to be a mere survival of the piety in which he was brought up. As Cheyne puts it:

> *Koheleth* is not a theist in any vital sense. . . . He certainly never lost his theism, though pale and cheerless it was indeed, and utterly unable to stand against the assaults of doubt and despondency.

This theism is actually the source of his perplexities, for Hebrew theism equated God with Providence, and in failing to discover any evidences of providential activity in the life of men, *Koheleth* comes near to losing God. At any rate, a God who has no personal concern for man ceases Himself to be personal. It is significant that *Koheleth* never uses the personal name "Jahweh" but always the more distant term "Elohim"—the Deity, who works inscrutably in nature. He is the "absolute" rather than the personal God of the Prophets. He is above nature and orders events in ever-recurrent

cycles, so that while things and events come and go, there is no progress, but only the same thing over and over again. Hence God has no purpose which is being realized in the universe, and man has no destiny. Like everything else he comes and goes; the generations follow one another, but they do not progress. The effort and wisdom of individuals make no contribution to the advance of the race. For there is no advance. There is no new thing under the sun.

This means essentially a fatalistic outlook that paralyses all effort. No amount of human effort can alter in any way that which is ordained. Else man could contend against God, which is unthinkable. Thus man finds himself shut in on all sides by barriers which he cannot surmount. Neither his natural nor his moral nature has free play anywhere. In A. B. Davidson's words:

> His chain is very short, permitting only the narrowest range of work or of enjoyment; and all he knows is that this work and enjoyment is the portion which God has assigned to him. . . . He is bound within an iron system which is unalterable.

Nevertheless there is nothing of world-weariness in *Koheleth*. He is "anything but weary of life". He wants more of it, not less, and his deepest horror is death. Far from being exhausted, his complaint is that the powers of man have no adequate scope. He is "confined by a superior power on all sides of him". He may gird against his limitations, but he cannot transcend them.

Nor is there any relief for the Preacher's mind in any contemplation of the future. There is no expectation of a Messianic reign of peace and blessedness. There is no "yonder" to counterbalance the "here and now", no bright apocalyptic vision of a renewed earth in which man shall find his satisfaction in the escape from tormenting limitations. Nor is there any hope of immortality. Sometimes indeed, like Job, *Koheleth* trembles upon the very edge of belief in an eternal destiny as the solution of the problem that is set by the futility of life. But, having looked at it, he deliberately rejects it. And indeed, upon his principles, such rejection was inevitable. For the belief is bound up in the developing thought of Israel, with a living sense of man's personal fellowship with God, and could not exist without it. It was because men had come to know in living experience how precious the friendship of God can be that they had dared to hope that not even death could break it. But *Koheleth's* God was not equal to so audacious a claim. He was not near enough, not friendly enough, for the Preacher to trust him beyond the gates of darkness; accordingly, although the anomalies of experience might have led him to seek a reconciliation in the thought of a Providence that rewards and compensates in the beyond, he cannot find room for it in his attenuated view of God. He turns away therefore from all speculations about the future, to concentrate his activity upon the

tasks and enjoyments of this life. For man is no better than a beast. Death is the same for both. "As the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they have all one breath; and man hath no pre-eminence above the beasts; for all is vanity". The state of the dead is described in the most cheerless language. The dead know nothing, nor have they any reward. The very memory of them will be forgotten. "Whatsoever lies within thy strength to do, do it; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest". Sometimes, indeed, life seems worse than death, so that it would be better on the whole never to have been born; sometimes death seems worse than life, if only for the grim reason that the living know they shall die but the dead know nothing. Thus all hope of a future, here or beyond the grave, to compensate or to fulfil, is ruled out by a mind that does not know God well enough to trust Him in the hour of final passion.

We recognize here a good deal that is akin to the modern temper. Nothing is more characteristic of the post-war period than the complete collapse of the Victorian optimism of progress and security; in its place we often get a mood of angry revolt against the things that were most surely believed and acted upon a generation or so ago. Face to face with the desperate uncertainties left behind by the greatest upheaval that men have ever experienced, there is widespread impatience with the utter futility of life. We have vast armies of unemployed, who can find no place in the work of the world; we have armies of employed who know full well that the future holds no security for them, and that any man may be cast upon the scrap heap at a moment's notice by the will of a soul-less management; for many men, the existing situation has brought about a slump in the sense of personal values. In modern industry no man really matters. If he falls ill or dies, there are a thousand men ready to take his place, and the wheels go round as before, while he remains forgotten. At the best his life moves within a very narrow circle. He is confined within a relentless routine that goes on through the years without any marked change. There is no new thing under the sun. Even honest effort will bring a man nowhere in the end. For even if he does raise himself to a subordinate position of management, he is just as likely as not to be turned adrift to find room for a director's son or *protégé*. He can do nothing to change effectively the conditions of his lot. His activity is mechanized; he has become a mere cog in the wheels of industry. What is there for him but to snatch at the few enjoyments that come his way, that enable him to forget for awhile? He will most readily agree with *Koheleth* that "all is vanity and a striving after wind".

As for the consolations of religion, somehow they seem to be scarcely relevant to his situation. Talk to him of God—the thought of the divine awakens no thrill. It has no hopeful bearing upon his

experience. Speak of the love of God, and he is likely to turn upon you with a point-blank denial that God really cares for men, at any rate in any individual sort of way. Where does the Providence of God come into his daily life with its hardships and its insecurities? And as for immortality, the man who has become the mere slave of a machine has neither hope nor desire for it. The sense of living fellowship with a personal and gracious God, and with it the sense of the infinite and eternal significance of life, is being crushed out by the hard necessities and the immediate urgencies of the struggle for existence.

I heard of a man the other day who may be regarded as in some respects typical. For many years he had kept a shop which brought him a comfortable income. His territory was invaded by a multiple store. Trade steadily declined, and at last he had to close down and start life again as a barber without capital at the age of sixty, just at a time when he might have looked forward to some easement of the strain. Formerly an active Christian worker and a deacon of a Congregational Church, he has now no use for religion. He finds it impossible to believe that God really cares for men. In his desperate necessity he cannot see where the love of God comes in. Prayer is a meaningless ritual that brings no help for the real problems of daily life. He feels that life is controlled by impersonal forces from which a man has no way of escape. Divine Providence, in the sense of a personal concern for individuals and their needs, has become of all things the most incredible; he still believes that there is a God, but this belief only makes him the more resentful, inasmuch as it seems to him that the God Who made us has deliberately thrust men into situations too difficult for them, and has left them to bungle through as best they may. He roundly impeaches the justice of God in confronting men with this hopeless and inescapable conflict, and in withholding from them the means to secure for themselves any solid grip on life. He grants that there may be people who can persuade themselves that, in spite of appearances, God still cares and helps. But these are a few elect souls specially endowed with capacities that the average man does not possess. He is not one of them; for himself he can find no help in the consolations of religion. All he can do is to set his teeth and make the best he can of a bad job, without hope or expectation of guidance or support from the Unseen.

It is worth noting that the typical and widespread character of this mood is evidenced by the fact that it has achieved philosophical expression in Mr. Bertrand Russell, with his counsel to build our life upon a foundation of unyielding despair, and in certain forms of American humanism which make man a lonely wanderer in the universe, who has nothing beyond himself to which he can make appeal, and is thrown back upon his own resources to make the best

of life. Nor can we come to terms with this mood without first recognizing its honesty and sincerity. The man to whom I have referred is probably quite innocent of philosophical theorizing. His problem springs up directly out of his practical experience. He has renounced religion because it does not help him in his dire necessities. Perhaps it will be said that his difficulty is due to the fact that he never has had any genuine experience of God, that even in the days of his Christian service in the Church his religion was nothing more than a traditional inheritance which never acquired any vital personal significance, so that it was easy enough to acquiesce in a divine Providence while things went well, but there were no reserves of spiritual experience to meet the challenge of disaster. But even if this is a true reading of the situation, it must surely give food for thought. Are there not many others in our fellowships who, while busy about the Church's affairs, have no personal and vital experience of the power and grace of God? How far does that account for the comparative ineffectiveness of our appeals, and for the manifest decline in the influence of the Church in the lives of men? How far does it account for the large number of people who drop out of church life in middle age, when the impetus of a habit formed in childhood has ceased to operate? Do we sufficiently realize that we are losing people at both ends? We give a great deal of attention to the endeavour to stop the leakage in the senior classes of our Sunday School, but we are apt to overlook the leakage in middle age. The causes of both leakages are to be sought in the same quarter. We lose youth because it has not yet arrived at a personal realization of the nearness and significance of God. We lose middle age because its realization of God has never been deep enough to stand up against the disillusionment that is engendered by increasing strain. As in the case of *Koheleth,* it is the loss of a personal experience of God which, more than anything else, accounts for the contemporary mood of futility and hopelessness.

Furthermore, it is the absence of a personal experience of God which, more than anything else, is responsible for a general abandonment of belief in and practice of prayer. No doubt pseudo-scientific scruples have, for many people, ruled out a considerable range of petitionary prayer, while psychology, with its emphasis upon the subjective effects of prayer, has raised doubts in many minds as to whether prayer involves any real commerce with forces in the objective world beyond man. But these are not the only, or even the main reasons, for widespread indifference to prayer, since there are people who can find room for prayer as a healthful discipline of the spirit, even without God. The fundamental cause is that God is not real enough, or near enough, in the thought of the average man for prayer to become a natural and spontaneous expression of the desire for deeper fellowship and clearer vision. One wonders whether

Koheleth ever prayed. He thinks it unwise to make rash vows to God, lest our failure to fulfil them bring upon us the anger of God. But as for real prayer, to whom could *Koheleth* pray? And for what would he pray? His fatalistic acquiescence in the doctrine of opportunism, and in the inescapable limitations to which every man is subject, seems to find its counterpart in the modern reluctance to pray because prayer does not seem capable of leading us anywhere or of *doing* anything really practical, and because God—if there be a God—pays no heed. Even people who most regularly attend public worship will often regard the prayers as the most irksome part of the service, and the part that awakens least response. Perhaps there is no more urgent intercession that we can make to-day than, "Lord teach us to pray".

A significant consequence of this failure to achieve a direct experience of God through personal devotion is a growing insensitiveness to the need of penitence and of divine forgiveness. In this regard, it is noteworthy, that, while *Koheleth* claims to be familiar with all kinds of experience, he makes no confession of sin, and that while he (or his interpolator) speaks of the judgment of God, he can give no hint as to how God's judgment operates. In this matter he stands in sharp contrast with the Psalmists. For *Koheleth's* trouble is not so much his moral weakness as the narrow limitations that shut in his life. Just because life offers so little, the way of wisdom is the way of instinctive satisfaction. Some moderns would emphatically agree, and would indeed go further. Mr. Llewelyn Powys, *e.g.*, will extol what he calls the Ichthyosaurus element in our nature, and will warn us to flee from the disturbing life of to-day with its incessant wheel-turning, and to sink back into sensuous enjoyment, which is the final goal of man. The modern world as a whole might not be prepared to go so far as that, but we do hear a great deal about the rights of instinct; and people are only too ready to condemn as Victorian stuffiness all conventional restraints. No doubt, that fuller understanding of human nature which psychology has brought us imperatively demands a re-thinking of our conception of sin. In this radically transformed modern life of ours we may have to revise our judgments as to what is and what is not sin. But it is a very different thing to say we have no sin. To use the language of John, that is a form of self-deceit which must always follow from a defective view of God, issuing in the fatalistic declaration that sin is not our fault but God's, or from a defective view of man, issuing in the flattering assumption that sin really does not matter. In Mr. Arnold Lunn's remarkable novel, *Within the Precincts of the Prison*, we have a penetrating psychological study of an innocent man who is condemned and hanged on a charge of murder. There is much discussion of God and of Christianity in a tone that is not hostile but friendly to religion. Yet nowhere do we get the slightest hint that

such things as adultery are matters of any great moment. The condemned man bitterly regrets that he married his mistress and thereby brought upon himself the suspicion of having murdered his first wife. But apparently he does not regret his intrigue with her. Nor is there any suggestion that the discovery of God involves repentance and the need for forgiveness. Is it too much to say that the modern world does not understand the language of divine forgiveness? So far from seeking forgiveness it is inclined to demand an apology from God for making life so difficult.

The sense of the futility of life is by no means confined to the classes who are subjected to the severest economic strain. It is widespread among the sheltered and the idle. World weariness is something more than a pose among the gilded youth of to-day, as witness the remarkable number of suicides on the part of young men and women, who, with all the advantages of wealth and its opportunities for the acquisition of cultural interests, find life an intolerable bore. The suicide of Dorothy Massingham caused another woman to ask the question: "What's the matter with life? Is the world so beastly that no decent people can live in it?" An uncomfortably large number of people in these days is prepared to answer in the affirmative. Now *Koheleth,* with all his limitations, has a better answer. Life is good, after all, so long as we can enjoy, not only our pleasures, but our work. It is the lack of useful employment that for so many people robs life of its interest. And here again, it is the absence of any adequate sense of a Divine purpose in life which creates the idleness from which springs world-weariness. "A man of forty", writing recently in the *News-Chronicle,* lays it down that

> only three things can bring a man peace. Any one of them may suffice, but two of the three are probably needed for most people. They are deep and passionate love; work that has joy and dignity and service in it; a sure belief that life is fulfilling some purpose —Divine, or whatever you prefer to call it. . . . . Without these a man may seek anodynes in sport, drink, gambling, lechery.

This same writer goes on to discuss the question "Is life worth living?", and returns an emphatic negative. His reasons, set out in all candour and sincerity, are singularly unconvincing, but their significance lies in their reflection of a modern mood. He has really nothing much to complain about so far as his own life is concerned.

> I should be called, I suppose, a successful man. I have plenty of work, I earn a comfortable salary, I have two charming children, I have never known (except as a soldier) what it is to be short of food, or to be cold and suffer miserable physical discomfort for more than a few hours or days at a time.

A singularly fortunate man, one would say. What then is his quarrel with life? He feels the pressure of the economic machine, which induces the feeling that we are not getting anywhere, but are

just going on day after day in the same old way, unable to stop lest we tumble into the pit. He is menaced by the absence of any prospect of security or repose in the years that lie ahead. After working for twenty years he has no more security of tenure than when he began. A stroke of bad health might reduce him to the gutter and his children to the workhouse. As for his sons, when he has done all he possibly can do for them in the way of education, he has no certainty that they will not be killed in war or maimed in a way that is worse than death. Surveying the world around him, he is depressed by the vast army of unemployed, as well as by the constant threat of war and consequent race-suicide by the horrible devices of modern science, not to speak of the glaring inequities of the existing economic system. The political system is hopelessly inadequate to secure any real betterment, while the physical and spiritual strain of the war, and the fret and worry of eighteen years of struggle since, have paralysed all idealism and effort. Both the war and the peace seem "so damned futile". He lays stress upon the failure of religion (*i.e.*, of the Church) in the war and in the struggle for social justice, as well as upon the "quarrels between various churches all professing to worship the one Christ", which have made religion impossible. And finally he discounts the much vaunted joys of life—friendship, nature, art, and literature—because they occupy, at the most, one twentieth part of life, and fail to redeem the remaining nineteen-twentieths.

> I see no purpose in life. Three of my best friends—and none is yet fifty, and all earn over £1,000 a year—have told me in the past week, "I am ready to die now". What sort of a world is it that brings men to this pass? There have been many occasions during the past few years when, lying down to sleep, I should have been content if I had known I should not awake.

Here again, it will be observed, there is the conspicuous lack of any indication of vital experience of God. Religion seems to be no more, in the mind of this writer, than an institution that stands outside the intimate life of man. The manifest wrongs of the world—and to do him justice, it is mainly the wrongs of the world as a whole rather than his individual and private wrongs that he has in mind—paralyze him with a sense of the sheer futility of life. He lives in a world with no love at the heart of it, and in such a world the only alternative to despair is the Promethean defiance of W. E. Henley. But even *Koheleth* can teach us better than that. Though his God does very little for him, and life at its best is futile enough, nevertheless God has at least given him some opportunity for enjoyment in pleasure and in work before the dark shadows close round him for ever. But Christianity will carry a man a great deal further than that. It will find in the very littleness of life, that makes it seem so futile, man's glorious opportunity to rise into fellowship and co-operation with the Eternal God, whose will is our peace. It may be

difficult to prove to an outsider the personal love of God amid the bludgeonings of chance, but Christ knew it inwardly, and so have all who have walked with Him in the felt presence of the Father. Moreover, in the last resort the only answer to those who deny the reality of a divine love that is personal, and succours us in our necessities, is Jesus, and with Him, the countless host of believers who have triumphed over the most untoward circumstances and the severest bludgeonings of fate, through sure confidence in the love that will not, cannot, let us go, now and for ever. The inequities and wrongs of the world may wring our hearts and drive us to despair, but they may also call out a man's sustained energies in co-operation with the God Whom he knows in inward experience as the grace that makes all things new. The man who has found God in his vocation, as Calvin would have put it, will gird his loins for that personal task of world-renewal which is his just because it is God's, and which must win through just because it is that specific element in an age-less purpose that is waiting to become incarnate here and now. To turn from the moanings of our modern *Koheleths* to the triumph songs of the Gospel is to come out of the prison-house of futility into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

What then is "the conclusion of the whole matter"? I agree most emphatically with Dr. Grieve's estimate of *Koheleth* in *Peake's Commentary*:

> Not without the Divine Providence has this book been included in the Canon of Scripture. It shows better than any other the need for the Incarnation, it forms a most effective background for the Good News that life is earnest and real, that man may find happiness in work and play, in study and recreation, in the comradeship of his fellows and the joys of home life, and above all that God is not a remote abstraction, but the intimate friend and comrade of His children; that the Kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy in a spirit of holiness has come, and that life and immortality have been brought to light.

Now all these are things that the people to whom we preach in this modern world find it very difficult to realize. They do not find it easy to lay hold on God, to be sure of Him, to trust in His care; they do not find it easy or even profitable to concern themselves with what may happen after death. They find the business of living here and now so desperately complicated and baffling. And this is the situation to which we must preach, and preach convincingly. Of one thing I am certain: if a man will study *Koheleth* with patience and sympathy, so as to understand his moods, and will then set over against his dismal creed what he himself has learned of Christ, he will find himself the better fitted thereby to understand contemporary moods, and to bring men who are disillusioned, disheartened, and depressed with a sense of the futility of life, to a new hope and courage and security in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The modern world is at the cross-roads. It is confronting the alternative between the chill and dreary pessimism of *Koheleth,* and the Good News of the New Testament. If life is to find poise and unity, its only possible centre is in the holy and loving purpose of a Divine Father, who stands as near to us as Jesus. The humanism that Lippmann calls the "high religion" of the twentieth century is an attempt to achieve poise and balance without God. But it is only *Koheleth* over again. We must find our resources entirely within ourselves; we must not ask from life more than it can give. As we grow "mature" and "disinterested" we learn that it is not possible to have all we want; we learn to discipline ourselves and to ask only for what is possible. We must learn to think only mortal thoughts; we must awake to the limits of man's capacity; knowing just how much life can offer us, and accepting it with tranquil resignation.

This is the modern equivalent to *Koheleth,* and is aptly characterized by Canon Barry[1] as Stoicism in plus-fours. It may be worldly wisdom for the "mature", but what about the "babes", who have no plus-fours, who cannot afford them, and would not know what to do with them if they had them—just ordinary folk who are tormented by conflicts of passion or weighed down by intolerable calamities? This "high religion" has nothing for them. And the only alternative is the Gospel. I will close with a paragraph from Canon Barry in which this alternative finds adequate expression:

> There is a real Christian form of Humanism which sings its way through the New Testament, especially the *Epistle to the Ephesians.* It offers all that romanticism stands for—the ample vista of man's potentialities, a far-flung reach and range of aspiration, a claim on life that has scarcely any limit to it—but all sustained, disciplined and fructified by a burning conviction about God and the vision of his transcendent love and holiness. This is the "humanism" of the Gospel. If we read the life of Temple Gairdner or recall that of the late Archbishop Davidson, we can see this attitude personified. We find it there in individual lives—vivid interest in all that is interesting, gladness in all the good things of life, a reverence for and trust in human nature, hallowed and controlled at the core of self-hood by faith, hope, love and consecration, enkindled by the vision of God in Christ. This is a faith which is built on foundations. Christianity, when it is true to its own genius, is able to believe in man recklessly, despite all that saddens and discourages, because it has seen the vision of God, the eternal source of all worth and wonder—lifting us up to become sons of God.

"Vanity of vanities", saith the Preacher, "all is vanity". But a nobler preacher has said[2]:

> Present suffering is a mere nothing compared to the glory that we are to have revealed. Even the Creation waits with eager

1 *The Relevance of Christianity,* 129.
2 *Rom.* 8[18-21] (Moffatt).

> longing for the Sons of God to be revealed. For Creation was not rendered futile by its own choice, but by the will of Him who thus made it subject, the hope being that Creation as well as man would one day be freed from its thraldom to decay and gain the glorious freedom of the children of God.

Can we make this real to the men and women of to-day—to those at the street corners or in the clubs, to the surplus unemployed for whom our economic system has no place or use, to those who are denied any real function in life, to those for whom the whole business is sheer futility, or who see some gleam of hope in Communism or Dictatorship, but none at all in God? Or must we confess ourselves beaten, and our Gospel mere empty speech? That is the question we must answer in these modern days. *Koheleth* perhaps may help us to approach it, but Christ alone can answer it, and it is our Christian duty to get busy about it.

M. Nicholas Berdyaev is all the rage, and to suggest that his message is by no means easy to understand is to fly in the face of fashion. Scholars, however, are just as apt as others to "take up" an individual if he comes from far enough away, has an interesting personality or career, and has a contribution to make that is not trite or commonplace, but it is perhaps fruitless to speculate whether Berdyaev's writings would have received the attention devoted to them had he not been a Russian *emigré*. All this, of course, is not to suggest that they do not deserve attention. They do, for as we have said in reviewing the books which have preceded *The Meaning of History* (Bles, 8s. 6d.) one has the feeling that he has something important to say, if only one could discover exactly what it is. Take this sentence:

> History and its conceptions are possible only when the world process is conceived as a catastrophic one. The catastrophic interpretation of history postulates a central fact—that of divine revelation, by which the interior becomes the exterior and the Spirit incarnate.

Those words seem pregnant with meaning. But what do they mean? And is their meaning not too coloured by the age of catastrophe in which we live, and by the writer's previous experience? Or again:

> The explanation of history as an interior metaphysical and spiritual, and not an anti-metaphysical, principle can be based only on a tie between the theogonic, cosmogonic, and the anthropogonic processes.

The book is full of sentences of this kind, so that the reader is pulled up continually. Sometimes the light changes and he moves on, but occasionally he stops so long that he has a shrewd suspicion that the signals are not working properly. And certainly we do have a good deal of "the predominance of gnosiological, methodological and pragmatical currents in philosophy"!

In this book we cannot help the feeling that M. Berdyaev has not been well served by his translator. One who writes from a strange *milieu*, and in an unfamiliar idiom needs all the help a translator can give in the way of simplification and clarity: how much M. Berdyaev has received can be judged from the translator's Note, *q.v.*

THE TEACHING PROFESSION: A LETTER.

[*In amazement mingled with other feelings I read the following letter. I give it as received, making no correction or further comment. A.R.W.* We hope "Thomas" and "A.R.W." now feel better. Editor.]

My Dear A.R.W.,

I'm no longer a teacher; never shall be again. I'll starve or beg, or better do hard toil, rather than teach.

I've been free several weeks and feel very content, quite light-hearted, after shedding the burden which, like Christian, I've dragged through the Slough of Despond.

Most amusing has been the sensation my resigning caused. I'm turned forty. Usually a teacher at that age has become hardened, inured, blunted, unable to do aught else but the jogtrot round "Like a demnition horse in a demnition mill".

I'd got bored. There's no cure for that except a complete change, a thorough shaking-up of oneself out of the rut of routine; and I've had it.

Also I've had criticism, questions, and advice galore. The consensus of opinion is that I'm every kind of a fool.

It's difficult to explain my reasons and principles to outsiders—and harder still to teachers—especially to get them to understand my mental standpoint, or to perceive the flat grey mist of fatigued inertia which was creeping upon me, a blight of the will, a species of intellectual paralysis: it afflicts officials and professional people badly.

Non-teachers thought I was chucking a real good job, one which most people would envy me. Security of tenure, a fixed increasing salary, and a pension at the end appear bliss to ordinary men and women, as near paradise as they are likely to get. Throwing that away was regarded by them as madness, or nearly criminal.

Some of my professional colleagues were variously indignant, confounded, incredulous, or pitying. To have doubts of education to-day is blasphemy: to criticize lese-majesty. Both are resented by teachers.

The majority of them were openly cynical and time-serving. They said in effect, with little disguise of their opinions, that whatever I thought or felt I was a fool to sacrifice a permanent salary and superannuation. If I didn't like the job or was worried or sick or fed up I'd plenty of holidays and leisure in which to rest and recuperate, seek health and diversion or stimulus.

That's the attitude of the generality of teachers. Some of them say bluntly they're not interested in education or child welfare, only in their salaries and holidays. Others do not put it so baldly, but I know they will forfeit all else to hold on to their posts and the money.

Really my professional brethren form one of the reasons why I left teaching. They're a mixed lot, dud mostly. It's a singular theory that teachers are cultured or intellectual. They're not. There's nothing inherent in their occupation to make them so. The few who do show superior mentality, breadth, learning, or specialized knowledge of an admirable type do so more in despite of their profession than because of it. Chiefly a teacher is a gramophone, upon which others place the records, a loud-speaker for the orthodoxies and conventional and official views, mainly an instrument of Government policy, a tool of the ruling class.

There's no scope for personality in teaching, particularly for the class teacher. Head teacher, director, inspectors, examiners and Education Committee all take care he shall have no chances to do anything different on his own initiative. In the class-room originality is anathema and experiment forbidden. To think is one of the major crimes. That largely accounts for the older teachers becoming such stick-in-the-muds. Their interests are primarily in beer, tobacco, sport, domestic details, small hobbies, gossip, scandal, tittle-tattle, and the minutiæ of their trade—"Oh, the sorry trade!" I thought it best to get out of it before I too sank down into the ruck of dull-eyed uninspired plodders.

I found the younger teachers rather pathetic and a little annoying. I like young people, and get on well with them. Some of my best friends are among the younger generation, but junior teachers form somewhat of a mouthful to swallow. They are superficial, and more than a bit snobbish. The girls especially, in vulgar phraseology, are apt to throw their weight about. They have a big estimate of themselves. Where they got it from heaven knows, or who told it them, but they've an idea that their work is useful and important. About as much as that of a policeman, prison warder, or asylum attendant, with whom they have many affinities.

I suppose it's impossible to disabuse their minds of the illusion. Unfortunately their salaries help to foster it. They start with a minimum nearly double the pay of a farm labourer, which is an absurd disparity. Putting it moderately, a farmhand is worth ten times as much as a teacher. He's the most valuable worker in the country, nearly the only indispensable one. His pay should bear a higher proportion to the average than it does, and certainly should be higher than that of teachers.

Teaching should be the pleasantest of avocations. To me it became the most miserable. I presume I'm a disappointed man. Many people are by the time they are forty, even some teachers, although a portion of them have by then become so hidebound, so impenetrable, as to have few sensations at all so long as their salaries are not reduced.

I was never too enthusiastic for teaching, so I'm not suffering from reaction or slump. I didn't have the smug self-esteem from which too many pedagogues suffer, but I thought I was going to practise a profession, and I might be able to do good to others as well as myself. I've done little of either. The former implies individuality, chances of doing things different from the cut-and-dried routine, the opportunity of the artist to exercise his talent without undue interference or danger of suppression. In teaching there's no room for special gifts. A genius would go insane or commit suicide.

That I've done good I'm extremely doubtful, as I am of the good done by any teachers. At times I think they're doing harm : creating a mentality and receptivity which are injurious, leading only to evil, smoothing the ground for bad seed. They're preparing the mass mind for politicians to pervert.

One has only to remember the last war, or to look at the present wrongnesses of perplexed Europe and America and the whole world to see what I mean. So-called highly-educated people seem unable to set things right. The masses are more liable than ever to impulses, suggestion, intolerance, and dictatorship.

Education appears to favour the last. Teachers have trained people to act in gangs, to obey orders blindly, to believe all they're told, to accept authority implicitly; in consequence despotism and militarism flourish with horrible easiness and dire results.

One could point to a hundred other faults in our social system and in people's private lives which all the strivings of educators have not eradicated. There is so far little sign of intelligence in the conduct of human affairs.

I'm like a priest who has lost his belief in the existence of God and a future life. For a time he can go on repeating prayers, preaching verbally eloquent sermons, and muttering the shibboleths of his former creed, but the time comes when he must leave the Church or be self-branded as a hypocrite and traitor as well as a liar. In teaching I'd reached that stage of scepticism and abandoned hope.

I fear I'm taking the matter too seriously. It's astonishing, amusing, and pleasing too, how children throw off the shackles of school restriction, still more how adults grow out of the customs of education, though its habits and prejudices linger with far too potent an effect.

Education chiefly takes place outside school and after leaving it, and most of all by forgetting what was learnt in school. We overrate the importance of formalized education. There are many influences in life more efficaciously developmental. I'm glad of that. I snatch at it as a crumb of comfort.

School will never replace home. A child from a good home is

educated regardless of what school he or she attends. Conversely the best school in the world can never be a substitute for a decent home, and can do little to repair the effects of a bad one.

I'm aware I am writing counter to accepted views, but it's necessary for that to be done. I'm suspicious of much of the enthusiasm for education. Parents want good jobs for their children. I don't blame them for that. There's a strong case to be made out for purely technical education. What arouses my ire is the talk about character-training, developing ideas, fostering intelligence, encouraging a love of the true and beautiful, and all that poppycock. Bilge most of it, eyewash, window-dressing, at which teachers are getting mightily expert. I've often laughed at the way we threw dust in the eyes of the public. One cannot be a sound orthodox teacher without having a sniffing contempt for parents. Being an honest man those sort of things grew unbearable to me. I've taken the straight course of leaving them.

The wrong people are enthusiastic for education. When one hears bishops, journalists, politicians, officials, aristocrats, employers, military and naval officers, and all of that sort advocating education of the mass of people one wonders. It seems fairly clear that they have discovered education to be an effective instrument for keeping the workers in their stations. It has taken the place of religion as a dope.

The Socialists will retort that they too favour education. It's one of the planks in their platform. They point to education as Socialism in practice. That strengthens my dislike both of Socialism and schools. Apparently the former is to be a condition of State servitude, with the citizens as well-fed slaves—will they be well-fed?—retaining no private rights at all. If the officials under Socialism treat us as teachers treat children I can only say: "God help us all! I'm glad I shan't be alive to see Socialism triumphant".

Hypothesizing education to be Socialism in action it's a miserable business. One of the features which turned me again teaching was the fact of being a Government-cum-municipal official. No one in private employment knows the thousandfold pettifogging rules which hedge one round, plus the infliction of pinpricks by one's so-called superiors. I've kicked at them many a time, and I won't have any more of the sordid, galling, unnecessary regulations.

The children are served similarly. The organization of schools is ridiculously complex. Life is made burdensome for the scholars in conforming to innumerable trivial laws, or being punished for breaches which are innocent and harmless. The intricacies and penalties of the internal government of schools are monstrous. I found them nauseating, intolerable to myself and to enforce upon their unfortunate victims.

It's a pity education ever came under State control. All the ills which one expects from a Government department have followed. I've mentioned officialism, over-regulation, and regimentation. A worse one is the trust in compulsion and the use of violence. As all Governments are based on force so do their departments and officials use it in preference to persuasion or any other more worthy incentives, allowing for no good motives on the part of those with whom they deal. So it is in education. Under Government supervision voluntary effort, willing interest, and spontaneity are killed.

This is especially lamentable in education, where human relationships are of greater value than in most other institutions: are of supreme importance. Instead children are merely numbers, regarded as animals to be driven and docketed and classified. Schools have become too painfully like prisons and asylums for me to endure them longer. Children's schooling should be paid for and directly controlled by the parents. That's why I consider private schools preferable to State ones.

After all I've written I need hardly tell you I don't approve of compulsory education. The last two words form a contradiction in terms. Instruction under duress is valueless, doing more harm than good. Yet we have the spectacle of stout and usually ignorant uniformed half-policemen employed by Education Committees to go round harrying children and harassing their parents. It's an insult to the parents under so-styled democracy, a grotesque travesty of what should be. As education it's a mockery. Also it's a hint of what a drastic weapon of tyranny education can become in the hands of a bad Government. Are there any good Governments?

That State practice of prosecuting the parents and persecuting the children is reflected inside the schools. It colours the attitude of the teachers toward the children. All of us in schools were conscious that it was a place of incarceration. Release from it was an escape: holidays a taste of freedom. I've been told openly by more than one boy that he regarded school as a prison—although he had committed no crime other than that of being young—and he looked forward to going to work as a promise of liberty. Where the strength of the demand for raising the school-leaving age comes from I don't know; not from the parents and children.

Consequently inside the schools the cane and tawse, detentions and deprivations, a host of penances and penalties, are in constant use. That was one of my most urgent reasons for leaving teaching. No more than I enjoyed being a prison-warder did I appreciate being an executioner, tormentor, or "kid-whacker".

For Wackford Squeers is not dead. He has his imitators to-day. There are teachers who hold the stick or strap in their hands the whole time, hitting children not only for offences but for petty mis-

demeanours which would pass unnoticed elsewhere, simply instinctive little actions natural to children, like talking and laughing and fidgeting. There are many gods worshipped in schools. Supreme in the pantheon reigns grim Discipline, who demands perpetual sacrifice.

The defence is raised that corporal punishment is used only for big errancies which need instant and vigorous correction. Let those believe it who've not been inside a school since childhood. I know different. Numerous teachers flog for wrong answers to sums or questions, mis-spellings, blots, bad writing, slowness, unpunctuality, dirty hands or knees, and a thousand other little juvenile failings in work and person and conduct which emphatically do not merit the infliction of pain. It's an easy method, shielding the incompetent, lazy, and careless teachers. I've met some who boasted of their frequency and heaviness of thrashing as well as their skill in causing the greatest amount of anguish and drawing tears. I did less of it than any other teacher in all the schools in which I taught. I wish I could claim that I'd not used chastisement at all. I could be proud of that. Education will not be worth the name till all force is abolished. Children have no choice of school or chance of escaping it. Because of that alone castigation is unjustifiable, neither can it be defended on any principles.

The barring of force means a revolution. Most schools as they are would be unworkable. They would have to be reformed and made fit for children. Education consists of finding out knowledge, not having it beaten in. Till the schools exist for the former I want no more truck with them.

And so my increasing abhorrence of coercion and suffering have helped to send me out of teaching. I cannot regret, rather it's something to increase my self-respect. Largely I've resigned from teaching out of disgust.

The curriculum was not inspiring. Higher-grade teachers may find some mental pabulum in the studies of their scholars when those reach advanced stages. In the primary schools the subjects and the achievement-level of the pupils have little intellectual stimulus. They are humdrum. How can I put it?—more likely to cause a lessening or lowering of one's cultural standard than a raising of it. Think of elementary arithmetic, spelling, handwriting, grammar, drawing, bare bones of history, geography, and science, drill, jejune songs, handwork with clumsy feeble fingers, and Scripture of a type which would shock an American fundamentalist by its crudeness. There was but one thing worse—the meaningless futile exercises of the drill period.

With especial horror and a little laughter I look back upon school religion. It's a brand all of its own, calculated to exclude beside

devoutness any modern idea, criticism, or comparison; it is a water-tight compartment of Bibliolatry and ignobly motivated ethics. Thank the Lord I've finished with that.

Pondering over my teaching career I cannot but say that much time has been wasted. I'm tempted to conclude that the whole time has been wasted. I might have been at a more useful, congenial, and profitable job. Even from the orthodox pedagogic point of view there has been waste of time and energy both on my part and the children's, and of money by the authorities.

No one, unless he has been in a school, can realize the long drawn-out delays, the endless waits, the hindrances, the deadening repetitions and pointless performances and ceremonies. The majority of teachers are arrant ritualists as well as being painfully verbose. There's a heap too much talk in schools, an excess of over-elaborated explanation, warning, nagging, scolding, grumbling, and threatening, especially by female teachers, beside too much bookwork and writing. The pupils ought to do a great deal more than they do; of the talking and still more of action and movement and construction as well as of observation and analysis.

On the topic of the children I'll say as little as possible, except that the majority are a dull crowd. Many are unpleasant in body or mind or behaviour, not to mention the defective and smelly and repulsive ones. The attractive individuals are few; the brainy ones fewer. Not all the latter win scholarships or go to higher schools, colleges, or universities.

It would take a whole book to explain fully in detail how I fell out of sympathy with nearly everything which passes for education in England. The prominent items would be my growing and now strong objections to compulsion, force, and punishment. Sufficient that I've completely lost concord with teaching, and so have left it.

I must find a man's job, where I can do some honest work without being ashamed or disgruntled.

Don't be alarmed by this letter. I'm very cheerful, nearer happiness than ever I was in teaching.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS.

GETTING READY FOR TOMORROW.

By Dr. Ivan Lee Holt.

In the primer put into the hands of the children of Soviet Russia there is this picture of the past and the future:

> They lived in crowded dwellings with little windows, with dirty corridors, with low ceilings. In every five or six persons one has to sweep and scrub the floors, cook the food, go marketing, wash clothes, nurse the children. With rare exceptions this work was done by women, the so-called housekeepers . . . Small wonder that after toiling fifteen or sixteen hours a day they were unable to finish their work. Rooms were cleaned thoroughly only twice a year, on the eve of some holiday. Children were unkempt and ragged. Food was prepared carelessly, and tasteless and deficient in nourishment . . . The food often burned, and a suffocating smoke spread through the rest of the house. Here in the kitchen also was a garbage pail; during the day this refuse poisoned the air: thus lived millions of people. And the remarkable thing is not that they existed, but that they did not all die. All this will be written about us a few decades hence. (In the new society) there will no longer be dwarfs, people with exhausted, pale faces, people reared in basements without sunshine or air. Healthy, strong giants, red-cheeked and happy, such will be the new people. Our whole life must be changed. Down with the kitchen! We shall destroy this little penitentiary! . . . Down with the dark and small and crowded dwellings! . . . Down with these abominable old cities. We must make them over.
>
> From the central square, like rays of the sun, avenues and boulevards will radiate in all directions. Buildings will not stand in a row like soldiers, all facing one way. Each dwelling will turn toward the sun in order to get as much of its light as possible. White house-communes, schools, libraries, hospitals, will be surrounded with flower-beds. At every entrance you will be greeted by green giants—oaks, pines, linden trees; the happy singing of birds, and the calm, sustained, refreshing voices of trees, instead of the present clang and rumble and roar, will be heard on the streets of the city.
>
> A great plan men have conceived, a great task they have set themselves—to change nature and to change themselves. Are we, such as we are, fit for the new way of life? We know little; we have few engineers, few physicians, few scientists; half of us above eight years of age in the village cannot even read. We need factories, not only to refine iron and steel. We need also factories to refine people; we need books and newspapers—many times more than we now have. We must eradicate drunkenness; we must close shops of alcohol and replace saloons with theatres and moving pictures, with clubs and rest homes. We must root

out uncouthness and ignorance; we must change ourselves; we must become worthy of a better life. And this better life will not come to us as a miracle; we must ourselves create it.

A long time before Lenin lived, a prophet of ancient Israel looked into the future:

> The wilderness and the dry land shall be glad; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of Jehovah, the excellency of our God.
>
> Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not; behold, your God will come with vengeance, with the recompense of God; he will come and save you.
>
> Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.
>
> And the glowing sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty ground springs of water; in the habitation of jackals, where they lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for the redeemed; the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor shall any ravenous beast go up thereon; they shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of Jehovah shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

The teacher of Nazareth, whom we call Lord and Master, challenged His followers with this vision:

> Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house. Even so let your light shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.
>
> Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even

the Gentiles the same? Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Whatever progress Russia is making toward the realization of its dreams, it is apparent to those of us called Christians that we are far from the establishment of such a kingdom of righteousness and love among men as Jesus and the prophets visualized.

The church does not exercise the influence on life which once it had. Once men were baptized on coming into the world for the saving of their souls; they were given the last rites of the church as they passed into the other world; they were married in the church that the marriage might be legal. Now baptism is not a sacrament for many people; the multiplication of funeral parlours shows how many people are buried outside of the church; marriage is first of all a civil ceremony, and the religious ceremony is a matter of choice. Life is lived apart from the church. Its task is doubly difficult because the ethics of modern America is that of a successful business enterprise. Millions are in need in a land of plenty.

The National Council of the Congregational Churches in a world of social injustices and antagonism to religion has set up a Board of Social Action. It has decided that the Church has as much of an obligation to right wrongs in the United States as to send missionaries to China. In an editorial comment, the *Christian Century* supported this decision but called attention to two dangers. The Church may become an adjunct to a Socialist political party; it may forget that the prophets never lost their religion in their passion for social reform. The Christian Church must challenge time in the name of eternity; it must stand above economic and political movements, to support the right and oppose the wrong. While I am very much afraid that the Church has neither the courage nor the conscience to cry out against economic and social wrongs of our day, there is danger that it may lose itself in identification with a programme of social change.

It is not my purpose to attempt another picture of redeemed society, but to raise the practical question: What must we do just now to aid the coming of the kingdom? The purpose of this message is to answer the question: "How shall we get ready for to-morrow?"

At the Conference of Modern Churchmen on "The Reformation Old and New" in 1932, Dean Inge read a paper on "The Future of Protestantism". He asked, "Does Protestantism, in spite of all its dangers and its varying mode, stand for something positive and absolute, or are all our truths relative and changeable?" He sees Protestantism as a survival hope, in its new forms, between the menace of Romanism on the one hand and that of Christianity's total rejection on the other. The Dean characteristically envisages an extended National Church, inclusive of the Free Churches under a federal system, but desires a "Church which could only exist in

England" as "our best contribution to the symphony of humanity". This is interesting as challenging what is really in the minds of English Church leaders when they salute the hope of Christian reunion.

Dr. Inge puts up several "attractions" of the Roman Catholic Church one after another and bowls them over. But one attraction is that—on her own terms and within her own defined limits, of course—she is catholic, in the sense of embracing in one body of faith men of all nationalities. The price she demands is too heavy for most Protestants, but that attraction is the allurement of the reunion ideal. Another speaker at the same Conference declared:

> The Reformation has not done its perfect work until it has woven into one living whole the essential and permanent elements in both Catholicism and Protestantism. The first step to which is to achieve a catholic Protestantism—or a catholic Reformed Church; and this requires a truly spiritual discernment of the elements which are essential and universal.

Bishop Barnes insisted that the Reformation liberty of private judgment made Protestantism the foster-mother of science; that it sanctions even a repudiation of beliefs held by the Reformers themselves; and that the Protestant birthright is not an acceptance of the Bible as interpreted by Luther or Calvin or Milton or Wesley.

> It is rather the application for ourselves, in the light of our own day, with reverence and humility, of the principles of approach to the discovery of spiritual truth which they wielded.

It is interesting to note that Bishop Barnes's three favourite apostles, "who could detect false assertion and false dogma at a time when they were backed by apparently unchallengeable authority" are Wyclif, Roger Bacon, and Peter Abelard.

These addresses point the way to a re-statement of Protestant faith and a re-organization of the Protestant movement. A new Reformation means both re-statement and re-organization; as a prerequisite to either or both is a "spiritual discernment of the elements which are essential and universal". The re-statement of Protestant faith and the salvation of Protestant institutions have one goal—leading men to God. That is no easy task, even if we could concentrate all Protestant effort on it. The belief in God has become vague; we have been seeking that irreducible minimum to which we can hold in an age of science; the result is that a declaration of faith is an apologetic and not a conviction. When we decide to emphasize evangelism and set up a programme, we may find the appeal almost a solemn mockery because we do not have a God to whom we can lead men.

Even if we find God again it is a difficult thing to lead to Him a man who is satisfied with himself and senses no need of salvation. We are given to saying that man can do for himself so many of the

things God used to do for him. We remind ourselves that we do not ring church bells and offer prayers in a time of plague or epidemic; we entrust the situation to the health-officers. Man has not only entered places of worship to destroy altars and proclaim his own sufficiency, but he has insisted on the right to live for the satisfaction of his desires. Traditional morality is in the discard, and there are many experiments in living. We have been urged in the name of liberty to discover for ourselves the nature of this world and our own natures. Men are not worrying about their sins and it seems impossible to revive any disquietude. One can scarcely imagine penitents kneeling at an altar of the church.

Furthermore, those of us who have been God's messengers to convict men of sin and lead them to righteousness have all aspired to be prophets of a new social order. In our zeal for the Kingdom we have often lost sight of the individual citizens. The Kingdom means profit-sharing and outlawry of war and refusal to bear arms; the city of God is mapped and plotted and the houses erected, when we discover that we have no people to live in them. This is a very difficult matter to discuss because one is subject to the criticism of reacting and reverting to the "old gospel of individual salvation". I have had two experiences in recent years which make me aware of the difficulty. In 1928, speaking at the Federal Council Meeting in Rochester, I was pointing out the fact that the Church was welcomed as an agitator in social and economic crises but not followed as a guide, and that in our programmes of religious education we were developing technique and erecting buildings without increasing the numbers in our church schools or getting results in changed lives. I suggested that we could not justify our ministry by impassioned pleas for social justice and religious education unless we kept in mind the goal of developing character. I was followed by a good friend who began his address with the old story of the fence at the top of the cliff and the ambulance in the valley below; he emphasized again those pronouncements of the social gospel which have been made in our interchurch gatherings for twenty-five years. There were many comments on my friend's prophetic utterances, and my insistence on the need of a vital personal religion was accepted either as a criticism of the social gospel or else as a conservative statement which needed no emphasis or support. The years since have shown that the whole drift of thinking has been in the direction of my message that afternoon in Rochester, and that my utterance was more prophetic than that of my friend.

In addressing a graduating class at one of our theological seminaries, I said that a man might make a finer contribution to world peace by introducing into his church a programme of education for peace than by signing a declaration that he would go to prison rather than support another war. At the *Alumni* dinner the speaker

insisted he would go to jail before he would go to war, and the graduates cheered him heartily.

I have been an enthusiast for the social gospel. For years I have boasted of my freedom in proclaiming that message, and I do not believe anyone has been more moved by it. But my pastoral experience has brought to me some of the conclusions which his philosophy and experience have brought to Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr; his facing about is not so surprising because the liberal Protestant leadership is facing about. The question I have been asking myself is this: Have I been as anxious about changed man as about changed environment? I do not think of the efforts for redeemed man and the efforts for redeemed society as hostile. Now I make the statement, conscious of both needs; once I made it and forgot the need of man's redemption. There is need of an emphasis where we have not been placing it in twenty-five years.

Let me refer to another experience in this personal confession. I was recently urging on a layman greater loyalty to the church. He asked me, "Have you not been preaching service and the social gospel in your pastorate here? I am doing in the community what you urged me to do". There is nothing to criticize in that attitude, but here is the thing that disturbs. That laymen lost by death a lovely daughter, and he went some weeks later to a Roman Catholic Retreat to get the finest experience of personal religion he has ever known.

We have claimed that it required courage to preach the social gospel. Some men have undoubtedly suffered through their loyalty to the Kingdom. But let us be honest. Has it not been easier to be noisy about some social injustice than to think through all the criticism of our faith to a satisfying knowledge of God, and to bring men nearer to Him? Some of the most superficial and ineffectual thinking about social problems is indicated in some of the boldest declarations. There is a sense in which thinking is avoided by a daring pronouncement. One does not have to think much about the problem of bringing peace to humankind if he can dismiss it by a declaration that he will go to jail rather than fight in another war. What seems a solution is often a way of avoiding a real effort for a permanent solution.

There are many indications of a change in the emphasis of our modern interpreters of religion. There is no abler preacher of the social gospel in the United States than Bishop William Scarlett, of the Diocese of Missouri. In a recent utterance of his I was struck with these paragraphs:

> And the traffic on this highway of the spirit is rapidly increasing to-day. There is an inner necessity at work in us, now as always, impelling us to this adventure into the Realm of the Spirit, this discovery of the Kingdom of Heaven which is within

us. We cannot easily escape our nature, which at its best touches the divine; nor can we escape the effect of that contact or deny the quality we know our lives should possess. In many ways He makes Himself felt in us and though we resist His pressure the resistance leaves us disturbed.

Unamuno has said that he once met the son of a famous professor of ethics, who scarcely ever opened his lips without mentioning the categorical imperative, who was lamenting the fact that he lived in a desolating dryness of spirit, in a state of inward emptiness. And I was constrained, says Unamuno, to answer him thus: "My friend, your father had a subterranean river flowing through his spirit, a fresh current fed by the beliefs of his early childhood, by hopes in the beyond; and while he thought that he was nourishing his soul with this categorical imperative, or something of that sort, he was in reality nourishing it with those waters which had their spring in the days of his childhood. And it may be to you he has given the flower of his spirit, his rational doctrine of ethics, but not the root, not the subterranean source, not the irrational substratum". Perhaps this is our trouble, we need God. We need Him in order that we may be really convinced that ethical principles count, that categorical imperatives mean something, that absolute values exist, the very texture of the universe, worth living for, worth dying for.

To a group of men interested in a kingdom to come, with a show of power and of victory over the nation's enemies, Jesus said, "The kingdom of heaven is within you". He was interested in a kingdom of righteousness and peace; none was ever more interested in the ethical implications of religion. But He would have men know, His followers understand, that no kingdom could came among men until it had come in their hearts. This Jesus, Who would bring the kingdom into human hearts, recall the spring to the souls of men, give to one and all the gift of abundant life, stands apart. We see Him through a haze. A story is told about the monument to Phillips Brooks in Boston. A man was standing before it in reverence. A washer-woman came along, put down her basket of clothes, looked long at the figure of Phillips Brooks, whose words had often brought courage to her heart. She turned to the man and asked, "Who is that standing behind Dr. Brooks?" "That is Christ", answered the man. "Well, anyhow, it doesn't look a bit like Him", was the comment. We know that Jesus Christ can bring spring again to man's soul, and yet the Christ we preach cannot do it. "It doesn't look a bit like Him".

We have theologized Him after the manner of the old Catholic view; "That Jesus, second person of the Trinity, is perfect God and perfect man. Our miseries are due to the sins of our first parents, and to rescue us from them the Divine Word came down from Heaven and became man in the womb of the Virgin by the operation of the

Holy Ghost. He lived, and for three years served. He was crucified and by His death purchased for us redemption. On Easter Sunday He raised Himself to life, and after forty days ascended". That view cannot satisfy us to-day; it leaves us reverent, but it leaves us also puzzled, confused, cold.

As an antithesis to the theological Christ modern thinkers have made the attempt to rationalize Him. The miraculous is eliminated. Scientific laws are carried back to the first century; all of the richness of life in its imaginative colouring is ignored. The Christ who is left could not have aroused faith and claimed devotion in any century.

Then in recent years, we have been inclined to make Christ a socialist reformer. He has been made the proponent of economic theories and a quoter of statistics. Christ must always be a friend of the poor and a protagonist for justice; but in our zeal for social reform we have insisted on putting Him at the head of our pet movements. Sometimes He has seemed no more than an agitator.

One of the noblest interpreters of the Christ in these days has truly said: "If we are to find Him in reality and truth, we must by sound imagination recreate the period in which He lived. We must try to see Him as He was . . . When we meet Him at the beginning of His ministry He is conscious of an intimate relation with God the Father. This rich experience is the most unique thing about Jesus—not a new ethics, nor a new interpretation of society, nor a fresh message about the Kingdom. The first stage of entry into life is love, and a social programme cannot be started without the motive power of a great love. To take His ethics without taking His personal discovery of God means failure. The life of God was for Him an enveloping reality—it clothes the lily, watches the sparrow, grants the gift of eternal life . . . His experience of the love of God made Him tender toward everyone in trouble. The cross is a revelation of love for those who hurt . . . any one can love those who help. Such a Jesus, close to God and close to man, is the companion we want". With such an interpretation of Jesus, these are the great ideas He gives the world:

(1) Every human is a child of God and of great value.

(2) Because every human is of value, we owe everyone we meet friendliness and help.

(3) God values and helps us all as we value and help each other.

One reason for the vital character of the writings of Paul is the fact that he knew those to whom he wrote as humans in a human world. Another and more important reason is the fact that he knew himself to be human, with human weaknesses and human strength. He might be transported in some vision, or in some mystical experience caught up into the third heaven, until he seemed to break all

human bonds. Yet he came back to earth to know trial, temptation, and struggle, to be buffeted about by this fortune and that, to do the wrong thing when he desired to do the right, to write to people clearly, reprovingly, and yet sympathetically about their weaknesses. One of the services of the Humanist movement has been the emphasis on human values; we are seeing that "human" and "religious" are not mutually exclusive terms.

There is a cultus of humanity which would glorify the flesh, and the altars of that faith are thick about us. Those who adhere to it will have nothing to do with religion, and always think of religious persons as those "who go about with grey paint to give a dark and cold exterior to life's rosy and vibrant colour". On the other hand, many devoutly religious people think they are speaking of one as wicked when they say of him, "He is so human". Can one be human and religious?

There is a very interesting discussion of this question in *The Return of the Hero,* by a brilliant young Irishman, Darrel Figgis. The story goes back to the struggle of Christianity against the influence of the old pagan faith. A group of twelve men is trying to put in place a block of granite; it is to be the corner-stone of a new church. Their efforts were in vain, when a beautiful hero of gigantic proportions came riding out of the western world on a steed of surpassing vigour. This hero quickly lifted the stone in place. Then there was heard a terrible noise, which paralyzed the twelve with fright. When they had recovered, there was a groan behind them; they turned to find an old man, of larger stature than any ever known, stretched out on the grass behind them. His clothes were faded with time and he belonged to another age. In the course of time they found him to be Oisin, one of the legendary heroes of Ireland. He was taken to the home of Patrick, the leader of the Christian band. In Patrick's hut he told his story:

> In a great battle my leader and my heroic men were slain. We were walking in our grief and defeat when I was met by Niamh, the Beautiful. She promised to take me with her to the land of eternal youth. With her I went and with her I lived. I was never to touch the earth, because in that touch I would grow old. One day longing for a sight of the old haunts in Ireland, I rode through the valley and found twelve men, pigmy men, trying to lift a stone. I leaned from my horse to lift it; it was easily in place, but my saddle girth broke and I was thrown to the ground. You behold me now an old man. Niamh, the Beautiful, and the Land of Eternal Youth are far behind me.

Patrick and his associates made every effort to convert Oisin, but the centuries between them made it impossible to get a point of contact. One day Patrick suggested that adherence to the Christian religion would bring one to heaven, where one could find his loved

ones who had died. Oisin was eager to become a Christian if he could find his son again. Then the Christians were faced with a serious question: Would he find his son in heaven according to their teaching? The son had not been baptized, and had never professed faith in Christ. The Christians prayed for Oisin's soul, and arranged many conferences with him. He would become a Christian if he were assured of going to heaven and finding his son. Patrick was sympathetic—and he could not think of God as being less sympathetic. He was sure Oisin's son, living up to the best he knew, was in heaven. The other Christians disagreed. Patrick came to love the old pagan, and he had a conviction his Master must love him. There came the day of final decision. Said Patrick's associates: "We are trying to save a soul under false pretences. Our doctrine teaches us that the father and son of Oisin are in hell. Better let the whole world perish than that the truth be impugned". Patrick pleaded: "Heaven is a place where all good things are preserved, and there are qualities in the souls of the old heroes worth preserving. We have conferred the right to enter heaven on many commonplace souls. Let us introduce into heaven some who could be humanly interesting". In the end Patrick was out-voted, and Oisin was told his father and son were in hell. The old warrior broke out into a rage, "I would rather go to hell with them than to heaven with such quibblers. One man's idea of another man's character is the best expression of his own".

The story records the experience of every generation, and there is always the struggle of life against crystallization. The smile, the radiant love, of nature and of man, heaven as a place of interest—these all belong to the atmosphere of religion. Not everything of human interest is of value, because there are foibles and frailties, but the Christ Whom we need as companion puts human values above all others.

The question is not, "Is Christianity true?" but "Is it possible?" You cannot prove to this modern world it will work, save by demonstration. Not for one moment must we weaken the social emphasis of the gospel, but in our zeal for the social emphasis we must not forget, as we have been forgetting, the need of changed men and women. There is something to think about in Dr. John Hutton's remark:

> The Church to-day needs an aim short of the ultimate aim of the Kingdom of God. The religious life of Scotland (as rich and fine a one as we know in Protestantism) has always had, I think, a very near horizon.

Perhaps we are ready for a great religious movement. "Every great religious movement coincides with a new discovery of truth", says Dr. T. R. Glover. We have discovered that nationalism is not enough, that science is not enough, that material prosperity is not

enough. We have discovered that a theologized Christ does not satisfy, nor a rationalized Christ, nor a Christ who is a mere social agitator. We must have a Christ who is a life-bringer.

At the Albert Hall meeting which united Methodists into the United Methodist Church of Great Britain, the most inspiring moment of the afternoon was the singing of the *Te Deum* by the ten thousand there assembled, just after the final vote for union. I saw Dr. Parkes Cadman leave the hall, only to learn later the reason for his going. Dr. Cadman left under the great inspiration of that singing, and went to his hotel. There he fell on his knees to review before God the years of his ministry. And as night fell and darkness descended he was praying, "Give me for the remaining years of my ministry the passion and the zeal to bring men face to face with Thee, O God".

We need a new consecration of Christian leaders, and we must have a "truly spiritual discernment of the elements which are essential and universal".

With all the ardour of my soul I want to see a new heaven and a new earth! With all the ardour of my soul I want the Church faithful in her task of redeeming the social order. With all the ardour of my soul I want to see Christians realize that following Christ means vastly more than they have yet found it to mean! The Church as it now is will beat its life out and accomplish little in such an effort. To get ready for to-morrow, the Church must become a sanctuary for the divine Spirit and not a temple made with hands, an abode for the human spirit and not an ark for the preservation of traditions, shibboleths, and polities. The human race has a long time yet, but a Church like ours has not so long a time. A Church which is the sanctuary of the divine Spirit and the abode of the human spirit has as long a time as is needed to make the desert blossom as the rose and men perfect as the Father in heaven.

WILLIAM TINDALE.

By the Rev. A. H. Moncur Sime.

On Friday, 6th October, 1536, William Tindale was led forth from his cell in the Castle of Vilvorde, some 18 miles from Antwerp and at that time the principal State prison of the Low Countries, to the place of execution. He was first strangled, and his body was then burned. But why, we ask? Who was this man, and what crime or crimes had he committed to merit such a fate? He was no criminal in the ordinary sense of the term. He was no foe to society; nor had he ever wittingly done wrong to any human being. He was a scholar and an English gentleman, whose sole offence was that he had made it his life's aim and purpose to translate the Bible into the language of his countrymen.

Much obscurity prevails over the whole early history of Tindale. More than one town in Gloucestershire lays claim to the honour of being his birthplace. A monument has been erected to his memory in North Nibley, but no documentary evidence to support the claim that he was born there has been established. A like honour is also claimed for Hurst Manor, Slimbridge, but here again tradition is the only available witness. It is of interest to note that the living of Slimbridge was, and is still, in the gift of Magdalen College, Oxford, and that it was at Magdalen Hall young Tindale was entered when he went to Oxford as a student. Gloucestershire was, without doubt, his native county, a county which was a stronghold of the Church. Within its borders it had six mitred Abbeys; it also possessed the famous relic, "The Blood of Hailes", said to be the blood of Christ, contained in a phial preserved in the Abbey of Hailes, near Winchcombe, the sight of which was supposed to ensure eternal salvation. So overwhelming was the clerical domination in the county that "as sure as God's in Gloucester" had come to be a familiar proverb. Can we doubt that young Tindale was shrewd and thoughtful enough to conclude that much of the religion he saw around him was a matter of form and superstition, and many of the practices enjoined by the Church nothing but grotesque and meaningless ceremonies? We have every right to conclude that the recollection of what he had experienced in his youth and young manhood furnished him with abundant illustration with which to point his trenchant arguments when he dealt with these matters in his maturer years.

As with his birthplace, so with his parentage; all is obscure. Tindale himself was always reticent about his relations, the reason probably being that he hesitated to embroil others in the storm of persecution to which he was for so long subjected. A brother actually became involved, in consequence of failing to hand over to

the authorities letters passing between him and Tindale. One legend was to the effect that the family came from the North during the Wars of the Roses, and, probably for the purpose of concealment, took for a time the name of Hitchins, spelt in a variety of ways, as Hotchyns, Hychyns, and Huchens. In his introduction to several of his books Tindale describes himself as "otherwise called Hitchins". This name was afterwards abandoned, and the family resumed the old and rightful one of Tindale.

We can only guess at the date of Tindale's birth. If, as has been reported, he was in middle life when he suffered martyrdom, say a year or two under fifty, we may assign his birth to 1487 or 1488. We learn from the Register of the University of Oxford that he took his B.A. degree in 1513, and his M.A. in 1515 or 1516. Attracted very likely by the fame of the teaching of Erasmus, who at that time was teaching Divinity and Greek at Cambridge, Tindale removed to the sister University, where he studied hard at the Greek language. In 1521, he left Cambridge to act as chaplain to Sir John Walsh of Little Sodbury, Gloucester. He was also tutor to Sir John's children. Much learned talk took place around Sir John's hospitable board (he kept an open house) and the young chaplain came into open conflict with the

> divers great beneficed men, as Abbots, deans, archdeacons, and other divers doctors and learned men who resorted thither.

Tindale was never backward in stating his opinions, depending rather on the pure word of Scripture than on the dictates of the Church. Oftentimes his remarks would give great offence, and not a few bore the clever and honest young clergyman a secret grudge.

Lady Walsh took Tindale aside after one of these disputations, and said:

> Master Tindale is it reasonable, think you, that we should accept your opinions before the opinions of the learned men with whom you argue?

Tindale felt the force of her words, but was in no way daunted. He at once set to work to translate from Latin into English a book written by Erasmus some twenty years before, *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* or *The Manual of a Christian Knight,* which was to all intents and purposes a protest, in the name of Christianity, against the religion practised by the monks and friars of the day. Here was the authority of his master and guide in spiritual concerns, the learned Erasmus; this surely would convince those who were not moved by his poor arguments, and by Scripture. This little work he presented to Sir John and Lady Walsh. It had the desired effect. They often read the book, and began to see with Tindale's eyes.

> Those great prelates were no more so often called to the house, nor, when they came, had the cheer and countenance as

> they were wont to have; the which they did well perceive, and that it was by the means and incensing of Master Tindale, and at last came no more there.

It must have been about this time that Tindale determined to translate the Bible into English. He left Little Sodbury and removed to London, hoping to find a sympathetic ally and patron in the then Bishop of London (Cuthbert Tunstall), whose learning was well known. He was doomed to bitter disappointment. To quote his own words:

> And so in London I abode almost one year . . . . . and understood at the last, not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England.

Well: if the work could only be done in exile and in peril, that was but an added reason why it should be done and done quickly. We recall his noble words uttered at Little Sodbury in the presence of his opponents, "I defy the Pope and all his laws . . . if God spare my life ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scriptures than thou doest".

In May, 1524, Tindale left London for Hamburg, and there, during a little more than a year, he completed his translation of the New Testament. In the latter part of the following year (1525) he went to Cologne to arrange with Peter Quentell to execute the printing. But his enemies were on his track, and they obtained an interdict of the work. On hearing of this Tindale, in company with one Roye, immediately rushed to the printers, and,

> snatching away with them the quarto sheets printed, fled by ship, going up the Rhine to Worms, where the people were under the full rage of Lutheranism, that there by another printer they might complete the work begun.

Here, the work started and interrupted at Cologne was recommenced at the press of Peter Schoeffer. It is thought that the quarto edition begun at Cologne was abandoned, and the edition in a smaller octavo size, without the prologue, sidenotes, or glosses, commenced in order to mislead the inquisitors. By the end of 1525 several thousands of copies of the Testaments printed at Worms were ready for distribution. The King and Wolsey did all in their power to prevent the importation of these New Testaments into England, but large numbers were smuggled into the country, and were widely circulated, to the joy and comfort of many who had long walked in darkness. Wolsey now took steps to suppress the seditious books. Search was made in every likely quarter, and all copies found were confiscated. At Paul's Cross John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, denounced the books as full of dangerous heresies. At the close of the sermon, at which Wolsey was present, surrounded by a great

company of Abbots, Friars and Bishops, large basketfuls of the heretical books were brought out and burned. Another sermon, to the same effect, was preached in October, 1526, by the Bishop of London, from whom Tindale had at one time sought hospitality and help. The congregation were told that there were three thousand errors in the translation, which, for the most part, were really so many new meanings attached to old words. These denunciations and burnings had no effect in stopping the circulation of the New Testaments, but rather stimulated the demand.

"No book that ever was written", says Dr. Guppy in his learned monograph on Tindale,

> has exercised an influence so profound and so enduring on the English-speaking peoples as the English Bible, and no man save Tindale has left upon its pages the impress of his individuality and scholarship . . . Indeed, the English Bible, with which we are so familiar, is, in its form and substance, the work of William Tindale.

Countless numbers will agree with Dr. Guppy's contention that but

> for the free and unfettered perusal of the Bible by the people, England would never have attained the position of eminence which she occupies to-day among the nations of the world.

Civilization, it has been said, is a matter of ideals. It is certainly the case that in every society there are a few great principles of conduct which, consciously or unconsciously, help in a most real way to shape the ideas and the aims of the majority of the people who compose that society. It is further the case that the ideals drawn from Sacred Scriptures or literature constitute the permanent and prophetic element in any society, since

> the things which lie close to the heart of any age from which the nobler passions of that age proceed, are the things which root themselves in religious literature.

The Scriptures of Confucius have stamped themselves deeply into Chinese character. India has been influenced enormously by its Vedic bible; the Koran has shaped and swayed the Mohammedan character. In much the same way our English Bible is inextricably interwoven with Western civilization. John Richard Green says that the power of the book over the mass of Englishmen shows itself in a thousand ways. When we get deep down, we come to see that our liberty, our democracy, our ideas of social brotherhood, were born from the conceptions of God and man which have reached us through these Hebrew Scriptures. To quote Dr. Guppy once more:

> Its influence is everywhere. It has crept into our language, it has crept into our literature, and it has crept into the very life of our people; so that we might just as well try to remove the leaven from a pan of meal after it has commenced to work, as

> hope to eradicate the influence of the Bible and its teaching from the English-speaking lands.

If, then, Dr. Guppy's assertion be only true in a measure, if the Bible has exercised so penetrating and beneficent an influence, the English-speaking race owe William Tindale an enormous debt of gratitude, since it was largely through his scholarship and life-long sacrifice that we obtained the boon of an open Bible, "at once simple, homely, picturesque, and racy", written in a language that the common people could read and enjoy.

For five centuries Tindale's version of the Bible has shaped the diction, phraseology, and style of every other. Its spirit pervades all its successors. The simple, sublime, and classic language of the Authorised Version is due to it. The Revisers of 1881 admit that their new Version was still to all intents and purposes the work of Tindale, and that 80 per cent of the words in the Revised Version of the New Testament stand as they stood in Tindale's revised version of 1534, for

> they could not find in the English tongue more felicitous phrases than those employed by him.

One has only to read Tindale's writings with care and understanding to realize that he was a master of English prose. His works range from his *magnum opus,* the New Testament translated direct from the original Greek, through Commentaries, Prologues, Prefaces, and Essays Biblical and Ethical, to adventures into theological polemics not a few. At a period when our language was still unformed Tindale made it quite manifest that he was able to express the deepest truths with grace, clearness, and simplicity. In many of his treatises—such as *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, The Obedience of a Christian Man, The Practice of Prelates,*—as well as in his Expositions of Scripture, he gives abundant proof of his artistic mastery over the language of his countrymen. These few examples will suffice.

> Ye blind guides, saith Christ, ye strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. Do not our blind guides also stumble at a straw, and leap over a block, making narrow consciences at trifles, and at matters of weight none at all? If any of them happen to swallow his spittle, or any of the water wherewith he washed his mouth, ere he go to mass; or touch the sacrament with his nose; . . . how trembleth he: how feareth he: what a horrible sin is committed: But to hold a whore, or another man's wife, to buy a benefice, to set one realm at variance with another, and to cause twenty thousand men to die on a day, is but a trifle and a pastime with them.

To those who objected to the laymen having the Scripture in the mother tongue:

If ye would teach, how could ye do it so well, and with so great profit, as when the lay people have the Scriptures before them in their mother tongue? For then should they see by the order of the text whether thou juggledst or not; and then would they believe it, because it is the Scripture of God, though thy living be never so abominable. Where now, because your living and your preaching are so contrary, and because they grope out in every sermon your open and manifest lies, and smell your unsatiable covetousness, they believe you not when you speak truth . . . . . The curates themselves (for the most part) wot no more what the New or Old Testament meaneth, than do the Turks . . . . . If they will not let the lay man have the word of God in his mother tongue, yet let the priests have it, which for a great part of them do understand no Latin at all; but sing, and say, and patter all day with lips only, that which the heart understandeth not.

What a telling description of Cupidity we have in the single sentence:

Dame Avarice, with as greedy a gut, as melting a maw, as wide a throat, as gaping a mouth, and as ravening teeth as the best, which the more she eateth the hungryer she is: an unquiet evil, never at rest: a blind monster and a surmising beast, fearing at the fall of every leaf.

Apothegms, too, abound in Tindale's writings:

He peppereth his conclusions lest men should feel the taste.

God is no patcher, he cannot build on another man's foundation.

When a Law made is no longer profitable, Christian rulers ought to break it.

If thy neighbour need, and thou help him not, being able, thou withholdest his duty from him, and art a thief before God.

If thou compare deed to deed, there is difference betwixt washing of dishes, and preaching of the word of God; but as touching to please God not at all.

Let every man of whatsoever craft or occupation he be of, whether baker, brewer, tailor, victualler, merchant, or husbandman, refer his craft and occupation unto the commonwealth, and serve his brethren as he would do Christ himself.

Every Christian man to another is Christ himself; and thy neighbour's need hath as good right in thy goods as Christ himself which is heir and Lord over all.

Cardinal Wolsey became what he would, even porter of heaven, so that no man could enter into promotion but through him.

It is an evil schoolmaster that cannot but beat only; it is a good schoolmaster that so teacheth that few need to be beaten.

Who, knowing the truth and loving it, would put his head

in the Pope's halter that so muzzleth men's mouths that they cannot open them to defend any truth at all?

From 1525 until his death eleven years later, Tindale was more or less a fugitive. Unceasing efforts were made by Wolsey and others to bring about his arrest. From 1527 to 1529 he was in Marburg, where he published the important doctrinal works *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon,* and *The Obedience of a Christian Man.* In 1529 he was in Hamburg, where he met Miles Coverdale, who gave him valuable assistance in producing the Pentateuch, printed in 1530-1531. In 1530 he wrote and published (probably at Antwerp) *The Practice of Prelates,* an unsparing indictment of the Roman hierarchy. He must have known that he was daring all, even his life, in giving expression to such views, but he was ready for any eventuality.

The remaining years of his short and stormy life were spent in Antwerp, where he was the guest of an influential citizen, Thomas Poyntz. Here, in a certain measure of security, he worked unremittingly on his revised New Testament and other books. Inside the house of his host and friend Tindale was safe, but outside he was liable to be arrested and rushed off to prison in some other place where the laws of the Church against heresy could be enforced. This is exactly what happened. He had accepted a fictitious invitation to dinner, and no sooner had he left the shelter of his friendly roof than he was seized by officers of the Church, and hurried off to the prison of Vilvorde. The trial, the verdict at which was inevitable, lasted for many months, and sentence of death was passed on him on 12th August, 1536. A respite of two months was granted him, during which time he struggled bravely to finish a work on which he had been engaged at the time of his arrest. It has been suggested, with some reason, that this work was a translation of the Books of the Old Testament from *Joshua* to *2 Chronicles* inclusive.

Death had no terrors for William Tindale. He had fought a good fight, he had finished a straight and goodly course. His last words were brave and magnanimous: "Lord, open the King of England's eyes". Tindale was distinguished above all else by his love of truth, and his courage and independence of mind. The words which Newman applied to himself, we might well apply to Tindale: "I am as little able to think by any mind but my own as to breathe by another's lungs". This unqualified allegiance to truth as he knew it, and his unswerving courage in following where truth led, brought him to a martyr's death, but the great work which he accomplished for his fellow-men was beyond the power of those who compassed his untimely end. "Truth alone can stand the test of time, and the more the life of Tindale is examined the more is he found to be deserving of the love and veneration of his countrymen".

GERMAN YOUTH OF TO-DAY.

By Harold Blundell, B.Sc.

However uncertain the National Socialist Movement may be concerning the feelings of adults towards its political and religious doctrines, it is making quite sure of the young people. Religion or political thought which has withstood a long, troubled lifetime of shocks is not an easy thing to exterminate, however much its outward manifestations may be stamped beneath the surface. The German government has not been slow in realizing this, and, whilst giving its fullest attention to the behaviour of its older citizens, is intensively concentrating in a great effort to bring up its youth in the way which, according to Hitler, it ought to go.

Not very long ago in the restaurant of Cologne Station I was approached by two lads of about eight years old who were in the first stages of being "conditioned" into being good Nazis. They were junior members of the Hitler Youth Movement, dressed in smart brown shirts and shorts, with brightly polished shoes and *swastika* armbands. They saluted me in the appropriate fashion, "*heiled*" Hitler and asked me for a contribution to their funds. In acknowledgment of a few *pfennige* I received heel-clicks, more "*heils*" and a copy of their marching-song printed on a postcard. The latter declares them to be Hitler's young soldiers, pledged to fight with bolshevism, communism, pacifism, and a host of other "*isms*", and calls upon Baldur von Schirach to lead them in the way the Leader wishes. On parting they told me they were "Hitler's Boy Scouts". Nothing could be farther from the truth. There is nothing of the tracker, camp-fire, or pioneer about such smart, good-looking lads. Their paths lie through the Labour Camps and conscripted armies to the brown- and black-shirted hordes who seem to find in the Leader and the State all their disciplined and dragooned lives require.

The old religious Youth Movements of Germany are rapidly becoming things of the past. Such Protestant and Catholic bodies have lost ground not only through organized propaganda against them in the Hitler Youth papers (*Young Folk, Young Germany,* and *Will and Might*) but through the difficulty in competing with the State subsidized equipment of the official organization, whose meeting-halls, gymnasia, camps, hostels, and funds are far ahead of those of its rivals. Furthermore, non-members of the Hitler Youth find it difficult to make friends during school days and to find work when schooling is over. The struggles of parents and pastors are often vain against such a combination of attractions and interests.

I travelled from Munich to Stuttgart in the company of a young, twenty-year-old leader of the Hitler Youth Movement, and learned

much from him. He found me a seat in a crowded train and impressed upon me that one of their first duties was that of courtesy to strangers within their gates. He was a living example of the "Youth led by Youth" slogan of the movement. Stationed at the Starnberger See, a large, beautiful inland lake between Munich and Garmisch, he was the paid organizer of aquatic sports, specializing in rowing, yachting, swimming, and, in winter, ski-ing. Like his fellow officers, he was a trained tutor in welfare, physical culture, and hygiene, and threw in politics and paganism as well. He had no religion, he told me. Baldur von Schirach, their Chief, taught that they were above religions and creeds, and, like him, he had no place for pacific gentleness, believing rather in making himself and his pupils into first class members of a State which is above all else.

All this my young Nazi told me with a conviction and confidence which astonished me. He knew exactly what he wanted and what he was going to do about it. Soon he would go, with the aid of a party grant, to Oxford and America, he said. There he would first learn, then lecture, and endeavour to promote friendships, acquire insight into conditions, invite comrades to visit Germany, and return prepared to pass on to his pupils any advantages derived from his trips. He knew very little English as yet, but with the assistance of a pocket dictionary and tireless industry courteously contrived to tell my wife in her own tongue that his party had no room for women in politics and that their places were in the kitchen and the nursery, and, if they wished, in church!

It has recently been estimated that only about 10 per cent of German young folk are outside the Youth Movement, which has a total of about six million members. One cannot wonder at the news, for the tremendous energy of the workers and the appeal of its trappings and glamour are difficult for unformed character to resist. Every boy and girl (the latter in the *Bund Deutscher Mädel*) has a chance of leadership in a body which is ruled by youth, for youth. Headquarters in Berlin keep a detailed card-index of every section and every member, with exhaustive particulars of each. Initiative and ability are encouraged, training for the outstanding ones, in politics, character building, and leadership, is assured by means of training camps and schools, and there is constant coming and going to and from foreign lands where relations are established and friendships made.

I asked a young Nazi what they did at their meetings. I was not invited to attend, but was told that after a certain amount of ceremonial and singing they were taught gymnastics (later extended by open-air training in camps), and the aims and ideals of the Nazi party. There, in time, they graduate to higher ranks, to the honour of carrying the party dagger with "*Blut und Ehre*" (Blood and Honour") engraved on the blade and, beneath the pictures of Hitler,

Von Schirach, Horst Wessel, and Norkus (their juvenile martyr), they dream of days of more active service. Until the days when, as fully fledged Storm Troopers, they will rush hither and thither in motor-lorries stamping on the monster of heresy wherever it raises its head, they learn to be good soldiers, shoot, keep their bodies trim and healthy, practise gas-drills and fire-patrols.

The German Youth Movement has much to teach all workers among the young. Its principles of youth governing youth give tremendous incentive for work to acquire rank, promotion, and general worthiness. The aim to be useful to the Leader and the Fatherland are also inducements to effort and service. The danger is in the creation of an army of healthy but robot-like pagans, pledged to obey without question the dictates of politics instead of conscience. One cannot help thinking, however, in the face of all the dragooning, that behind the uniformity of bodies and the "canalization" of emotions there is a soul which cannot be moulded by drills and propaganda. In this lies the hope of the intellectual opposition to the movement in Germany. Among this youth, so cramped and stereotyped by official and bureaucratic restrictions, one frequently finds evidence of that divine spark which, in its season, will once again burn as the flame of liberty of conscience, life, and thought. History tells of innumerable pauses and set-backs in the march of spiritual progress, but it is contrary to all experience and spiritual law that the advance of truth and divine purpose shall be indefinitely stemmed by retrograde human scheming.

The Gospel of Fulfilment (S.P.C.K., 5s.), by the Rev. R. A. Henderson, the late Vicar of Heckmondwike (a reminder that the Spen Valley is not wholly given over to Independency), is, in the words of the Archbishop of York, "a careful and reverent study" of the Fourth Gospel. Had the author himself lived to see it through the press he would hardly have given two (and almost three, of the four) sections of his introduction the same title. The reader will not find here anything of the kind with which Prof. Dodd delighted and informed his crowded audience during the May Meetings, but the Fourth Gospel has many facets. Mr. Henderson's method is that of a devotional commentary. His main divisions are The Prologue, The Manifestation (1^{19}-2^{22}), The Conflict of Faith (2^{23}-8), The Issues of the Judgment (9-12), The Glory (13-20), The Appendix. The book is the product of a devout spirit and may cordially be recommended for the quiet hour.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND THE CULTURED PAGAN.

By Miss Helen Macdonald, M.A.

No very deep or intimate knowledge of India to-day is needed to discover that her attitude to Christ is very different from her attitude to Christianity, as she sees it exemplified in the Christian Church. A Moslem woman recently said to me about the admission of her daughters to our Mission school:

> By all means let them study the Bible and the principles of Christianity, let them come to their own conclusions about Jesus Christ, but you must see to it that they do not declare themselves Christians.

In a word, the educated classes of India to-day are often prepared to honour Jesus Christ and to assimilate Christian teaching, but they are not prepared to contemplate linking themselves to the Christian Church or to allow those over whom they have control so to link themselves.

This being so, the results of missionary work amongst Moslems (and I suppose that what I say of Moslems is true of Hindus also, but my scanty knowledge of Hindus makes it impossible for me to speak too definitely) are likely to be, and in fact are, of two kinds. Firstly, there are the very few who do, from time to time, make open confession of their faith in Jesus Christ and ally themselves to His Church by baptism, thereby almost invariably finding it necessary to break away from home and family. Secondly, there are those who are deeply influenced in thought and action by Christian teaching, whose lives are the better for their contact with Christ, but who never declare themselves Christians. In reference to these last it is said, and truly said, that the non-Christian religions are being permeated by Christianity, and this is regarded as a sign of hope and promise for the future.

I do not wish to discuss here the problems (their name is legion) connected with those who decide to confess openly their faith in Jesus Christ, but rather to turn attention to those others, in schools, colleges and zenanas, whose lives are, as we say, permeated by Christian teaching but who remain, outwardly at any rate, loyal to the faith of their fathers. And here let me say at once that it is my conviction that in regard to these we are, as a missionary body, both too satisfied and too despondent.

When Christ sent out His disciples, first to the Jews and then to the many races and peoples of the Roman Empire, He did not say "Go and permeate all nations with my teaching" but "Go ye therefore and make

disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . . . " Instead of Judaism, missionaries in India to-day are faced with Islam, and instead of the varied creeds and philosophies of the Roman world, they are confronted with Hinduism with all its ramifications. But the call (and probably to a large extent the problems) remains the same—the call to "make disciples" and "baptize".

For this reason, while we thank God for every evidence of the working of His Holy Spirit among the non-Christian peoples, we ought not to be satisfied with mere permeation, or to feel that our task is well and truly done so long as those upon whom our influence falls are content, for the most part, to remain secret disciples, or, appalled by the very real and grave difficulties which confront them, avoid making a definite decision, even in their own hearts, and drift into a benign tolerance and appreciation of the good which is in all religions. There is still a cross at the heart of Christianity, however much we may seek to camouflage it, and it was a stern word which Christ uttered when He said "Let the dead bury their dead". Let us praise God for all that is good and true in the non-Christian religions—but, in doing so, let us not forget that Jesus is unique and that it is only that Cross, built as it is into the very fabric of Christianity, which can save the world.

But while our hearts are filled with a "divine dissatisfaction" because of those who do not openly confess Him, let us at the same time not be over despondent because many are slow to ally themselves with the Church as at present constituted in India. We hear on all sides to-day that it is the supreme task of the Christian missionary to build up the Church. While I too would underline the importance of the Church, I challenge the statement that to build it up is our supreme task. For I believe that God is calling us to enlarge our horizon and to see an even wider vision than that of the Church triumphant.

Let us think for a while of the Church in England. Much as we may dislike having to admit it, we cannot, if we are honest with ourselves, deny the fact that in these days the Church in England is being "weighed in the balances". Will she be "found wanting" or will she, in these days of crisis, take the place in the national life that she ought to occupy, and lead the country to triumph over evil at home and abroad? There is to-day no lack of interest in religion (the daily press gives evidence of that) but there is, on the whole, indifference to the organized Church. There are those who are perplexed by religious problems but who do not go to the church for an answer to their questions. There are true followers of Christ who do not seek to serve Him through the agency of His Church.

For those of us who dearly love the Church and all that it stands for, and who have found Christ in and through this institution, it is exceedingly difficult and painful to contemplate a form of Christianity which does not find expression through the Church, as we know it. We hasten (and it is well that we do) to repair the breaches, to strengthen the walls, protecting, by every means in our power, our sacred institution from the ravages of assault or decay. It may well be that the Church in England will triumph over all her foes and that whatever modification in her organization may be necessary in order to meet the needs of these modern days will come quietly and gradually from within. Or it may be that either through the failure of the Church, or because God in His infinite wisdom has plans other than ours, the Church, as we know it, will be superseded and Christianity may find its expression in some new order. One frequently hears critics of the Oxford Group Movement saying that those within the movement tend all too readily to dissociate themselves from the

Church—and on the other hand, there comes at times a note of warning from within the Church against the danger of alienating the adherents of this movement. This may be indicative of a trend of the times—Christianity tending to outgrow its own institution, Christ refusing to be shackled even by His own "body".

Much of what has been said above may also be applicable to India. The Indian Church is young as yet, but there are many who love her dearly and see in her God's "chosen vessel" for the evangelization of India. Can she give an adequate answer to the 60,000,000 untouchables who are wondering whether they may find in Christianity a solution of their problems? Can she meet the need of those educated non-Christians whose lives have been, through missionary endeavour, permeated by Christian teaching? Missionary societies, both foreign and indigenous, must be regarded as temporary expedients, and apart from these there is no other agency for the evangelization of India but the Church. We therefore do right to seek to make her ready for her "day of opportunity". But while doing so, let our vision not be bounded by the four walls of the Church. In spite of laudable attempts to discover what an indigenous Church, such as would really meet India's needs, ought to be like, the Indian Church remains exotic, a characteristically western structure. As she exists at present she cannot meet India's deepest need, and the same problem arises which has arisen in the case of the Church in England—will she gradually be transformed from within or will the salvation of India come through other means?

If there is to be some other means, no foreign missionary society can decide what form it ought to take. We can only seek to rid ourselves of pre-conceived ideas, to be entirely open to God's leading, and, while hoping and expecting that those whose lives we touch in our missionary endeavour will confess their allegiance to Christ in no uncertain terms, we ought not, perhaps, to strive too hard to make them fit into the framework of the Church as it exists at present.

It was said recently by a London pastor that the Church in these days needs desperately not so much those who have lived all their lives in a religious atmosphere, but the "cultured pagans". The Church in both countries may be too set in its ways ever to open wide its doors to those for the lack of whom it is ill-nourished and starved. It was once said to the writer that the people in a certain district would not come to a missionary meeting unless the proceedings began with tea and buns! Tea and buns may, I suppose, be taken to symbolize any kind of social or material advantage which has been used to attract those outside the Church. But we waste our time and damage our cause if we seek to present any attraction other than Christ Himself. Whenever and wherever He is presented He will attract, for "He must reign". The pagan Englishman and the educated non-Christian Indian need Him—and to present Him as the only Saviour is surely the supreme task of the missionary at home or abroad.

Is it not true of Christ's body, the Church, that "this mortal must put on immortality", whether the change be a gradual one coming from within and gathering in all true believers, or whether, when the cultured pagans of all lands see Him in His beauty, a new order shall arise which, bearing the name of Church or being called by some other name, shall nevertheless be in truth His body, His visible Presence on earth? In contrast to Islam, which is essentially static, Christianity is by its very nature dynamic. These are not days in which to be afraid of a little dynamite but days in which we ought to go on in faith believing that "the best is yet to be".

STATE AND CHURCH IN MEXICO.

By Louis Borrill.

In many ways Mexico is an interesting country. Hers is an ancient tale, her peoples mixed and curious. Her big neighbour, the United States of America, has gifted her with a chequered, violent history in recent times, a history which has seen many interesting social experiments. One of these, of interest to progressives everywhere, is an experiment towards ridding herself of the excessive influence of the Church. Yet, because of Europe's travail and the belief that Mexico is a small Russia, little is known of it in Europe.

The large programme of social development Mexico has since fathered is a direct outcome of this disestablishment. For instance, the Revolutionary Government has freed 7,604,880 hectares of land for division among the people; it has begun a scheme of rural schools enrolling 145,000 children and adults for education by film, travel, and open-air theatre. Progress in labour legislation, temperance work, protection of women and children, and in public health has been considerable. Between the Mexico of to-day and the Mexico of yesterday there is a bridge of splendid social achievement. Enthusiastic belief in the possibility of a new Mexico and a desire to break with the blackness of the past have driven and are driving Mexico on. Outstanding to the outside world, though, is the fact that in the midst of all this, hundreds of churches are closed. Those which function are not only spectators of, but are almost entirely excluded from, most spheres of life. For instance, the Church is not allowed to "tamper" with education.

Mexican history shows clearly the development of this anti-religious feeling. Three periods are clearly marked in Mexico's modern history: that of the Independence finally achieved in 1821; the Liberal Reform of 1857; and the Revolution (1910-21), the last and most virile movement of which is now working. The Independence movement was a reflection of a vague wish among the people for social improvement. But its outcome was mild reform, which left political power in the hands of the land-owning and clerical oligarchy, and a disillusioned minority of rebellious military units waiting to wrest it from them. Most of the demands of Latin American Liberals were allowed by the Reform of 1857: the lay school, nationalization of ecclesiastical properties, secularization of cemeteries, and religious freedom. These were believed to be the necessary foundations for building up the social welfare. Political interests, in the guise of French intervention, failed to bring a clerical restoration, much of the effects of which, however, the Dictator Porfirio Diaz (1876-1910) secured by concessions to the Church, without touching the Liberal Reforms.

For the next few years Mexico was torn by civil war. Her population was reduced thereby by nearly a million. The first of the chiefs of the Revolution, Madero, contributed his iota to the Constitution of 1917, and the rest added theirs in turn. Framed in the stress of fighting, and hardened by the violent partisanship of the clergy, who were once again on the side of reaction, it was built so that the Church would be powerless to use the political machine against the new ideals. Later, when the influence of the Russian Revolution was felt, it began to enter upon its present social revolutionary phase.

Socialist ideas find little place in the Constitution, though it is nationalist and liberal with a socialist flavour. Its dissimilarity from the Russian is due to the fact that it was framed from camp fire discussions, from opinions hotly disputed in the camp and bivouac, and from men's instincts and burning grievances, rather than by professional jurists and

students of a body of political doctrine.

Religion is thrice affected by the Constitution: by laws regulating property, education, and the ministry. Lucas Alamán, the Catholic historian, reckoned the property of the Church in the nineteenth century to amount to one-half of the total real estate of the country: this included churches, church offices, vicarages, and convents. Now this property belongs to the nation. The Government says what churches are to open. For Mexico City's 1,000,000 people there are 25 out of 300 churches functioning. Many churches have become schools, others are closed.

But the revolutionaries' educational policy has roused more trouble than the property issue. Till 1934, education was secular, but by a repair of Article 3 of the Constitution it was made "socialist". By socialist is not meant that bias towards freedom from indoctrination in education advocated by socialists, but solely and simply complete freedom of education from all religious influence. The education given under this law proves to be irreligious at least, anti-religious at most. Private schools must comply with Article 3, which stops churches from giving schooling.

The Christian ministry has been strictly controlled. Governors of States are empowered by the Constitution to fix the number of ministers to be licensed, and they must be of Mexican birth. Only licensed ministers can perform religious ceremonies involving acts of public worship, preaching being excepted and sacramental acts included in the constitutional reading of an act of public worship. This law has been applied everywhere except against Christ Church, the church of the foreign colony in Mexico City. No ministers at all are allowed in seven States, and the once-powerful Catholic Church has under 200 licensed ministers for over 17,000,000 people. The regulations in some places allow priests, but demand their obedience to rules, such as that all priests must marry, which make priesthood impossible. Each separate denomination among the Protestant Churches is reckoned by the law as a "religion".

These and similar measures have produced widely differing reactions. The Catholic Church says that it is being violently persecuted, and has shown some cases of real hardship; the Protestants make little complaint. The Government says that it is not anti-religious, and holds that the hardship or restriction suffered by the Churches or their servants is the consequence of their lack of organization and their persistent interference in politics. There has been some slight easing of the tension between State and Church since 1929, when the churches were re-opened, but in general feeling runs high between them, particularly over the education question. Naturally, as the most powerful Church, and therefore the hardest hit by the law, the Catholic Church is most in opposition, but the law has been impartially imposed upon all denominations.

In the State of Tabasco, extremism has razed the Cathedral, and no religious services have been held for the last seven years, but in the summer of 1935 by order from the President the local administration in Tabasco was suspended, and with this step other moderating influences set going by the President have somewhat counterbalanced the extreme tendencies of 1928.

Wisely the Government has kept anti-clerical legislation from becoming anti-religious activity, knowing that the Church would thereby immediately gain the sympathy of a mass of religiously indifferent people whose cultural traditions are lay and liberal. Its aim appears to be to let religion die the lingering death it believes is inevitable when its material props are removed.

The Churches, of course, are actively fighting their repression. The Evangelicals are resolved on a fight and have temporarily united for it. Catholicism is very active too. Catholic influence is strong on the

Municipal Councils, and the Federal Government is constantly removing from high office officials found using their positions for the advancement of the Catholic Church. Four State governors and five senators were deposed in December last and imprisoned for being concerned with a group of Callistas, followers of General Calles, the Catholic general, who wishes to implant a Catholic-Fascist *régime* in Mexico.

AN INTERNATIONAL BAZAAR.

By the Rev. Peter Gordon.

In my old church at Stockton-on-Tees, one of the most hard hit areas in the Tees-side, an International Bazaar was recently held; it proved to be very attractive, and provided the opportunity and scope for originality, and readers of *The Congregational Quarterly* may like to have details.

In this Bazaar the following countries were represented: China, Japan, Italy, France, Belgium, Hungary, Switzerland, Holland, Serbia, Ireland, and Spain. The scheme of decoration was very simple and inexpensive, but none the less striking and effective. All the stalls were decorated in the national colours of the countries they represented, and the stall-holders were dressed in the particular national dress of the various countries. This lent a great deal of colour to the occasion. Over each stall was hung the national flag of its country, and from the flags streamers were taken to the centre lamp in the Schoolroom and joined together. The gathering-up of all the nations into one great unity was in keeping with the spirit of all who attended the Bazaar, all of whom were inspired by the third verse of the opening hymn, "These things shall be":

> Nation with nation, land with land,
> Inarmed shall live as comrades free;
> In every heart and brain shall throb
> The pulse of one's fraternity.

To heighten the effect of the decoration scheme, application should be made to any Touring Company for large posters which portray the beauty spots of the Continent and elsewhere. We found the local branches of these Companies very sympathetic and eager to lend whatever assistance was possible.

With regard to the costumes, national peasant costumes of almost every country in the world can be hired from the Y.W.C.A. National Offices, Central Building, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1. The fee for the hire ranges from 1s. 6d. to 2s., and all who have seen them will agree that such charges are extraordinarily reasonable. Valuable assistance can be obtained from the Secretary, League of Nations Union, 15 Grosvenor Crescent, London, S.W.1. We were helped a great deal from this source.

In addition to the stalls we had other branches which took on a particularly International appearance. The room in which gentlemen could drink coffee, made and served by girls in Chinese dress, was decorated in the colours of the Chinese flag. Nearby, one of our young men had a "Shadow-Graph Studio". He was dressed as a typical French artist, and his "studio" was most artistically decorated in red, white, and blue. The refreshments were served in "Ireland" by handsome young "colleens".

The opening ceremony on the second day of the Bazaar was carried out by children. It took the form of a short play, specially written, and in this way we tried to convey a lesson to all the children present about the great work that is being done by the League of Nations. Should any interested reader contemplate such a Bazaar as I have tried to describe I shall be glad to send a copy of this play if children take any part in the opening ceremonies.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

THE PUBLIC AND THE NEWS.

By Commander Stephen King-Hall.

Sir Norman Angell in his book *The Public Mind* recounts how in a certain constituency during the 1918 election the candidate who won the seat had three points in his favour. They were (A) He had killed seven Germans with his own hand. (B) He had married a popular local music-hall star. (C) He had kicked the winning goal in a local football match.

Armed with these qualifications our hero was triumphantly returned to a Parliament which insisted that Germany must pay £24,000,000,000 (nine noughts please) of reparations and for the most part in money! The voices of economists who endeavoured to argue that this attempt to get a gallon out of a medicine glass was doomed to failure were drowned by the roar of public opinion which exulted in the fact that Germany would be squeezed "till the pips squeaked".

This story was recalled to my mind as a result of a wallow in the columns of the large circulation daily press. The amount of *SLUSH* which is dished up to the great public in its popular papers is deplorable. The chief news story in such papers is more often than not either nauseating or ridiculously trivial. In other cases an interesting piece of news is stuntified until one is inclined to ask whether the whole country or only some of its newspaper editors have completely lost all sense of proportion. I'll give you a couple of examples. First, the case of the *Queen Mary*. She is a fine and interesting vessel; a noteworthy achievement of British industry, but Heavens above! the whole world did not stand still whilst 82,000 tons of metal started across the Atlantic carrying amongst her company a couple of hundred journalists who had to invent stowaways in order to produce "copy" until a real one providentially emerged from the obscurity of the firemen's mess. For instance, on the day of her departure it was announced in Moscow that a national campaign was to start in Russia by press, platform and wireless with the object of reintroducing a number of restrictions which will regularize family life. At first glance you may be inclined to say (if this is news to you): "That sounds dull and and in any case is of no interest to me". Is it dull? On the contrary, it is reeking with "human interest angle" *if* that's the kind of plate on which your news must be dished up. Let's get right down to it. Abortion is to be made illegal, and women undergoing illegal operations will be publicly censured the first time and fined the second time. The doctor will be jailed. Divorce is to be made much more expensive, and there is to be an increasing scale of charges for a second and third divorce. A divorced man with three children will have to pay up to 60% of his earnings in alimony. A whole series of grants is to be made to encourage large families. Any child over Number Seven will bring in to his parents an income of about £150 (gold) for five years. If the parents persevere till they score eleven children, the last born will earn £200 a year for five years. Even without these encouragements the annual increase of the Russian population is at least 3,000,000. Our own population is about to begin to decline in numbers, and according to one authoritative estimate will—unless we change our social habits—be about 41½ millions in 2036! A more conservative estimate anticipates a halving of our numbers in a century. That we shall lose 10 million within your life-time is almost a certainty. Need I repeat my question as to whether State control of family life in Russia, with a view

to accelerating an increase of population, has any interest for a nation whose people are declining in numbers?

On the same day, I also read that the B.B.C. were hoping to lure me to the loud-speaker in order to hear "the noise of the *Queen Mary's* express lifts going up and down"! What the dickens am I supposed to be, a nit-wit from the Stone Age who has never heard a lift—and in any case modern lifts should be noiseless. It was on this day also that April 1st, 1937, was appointed as the moment when Provincial Autonomy is to come into force in India. Think what that means! Self-government is to start in Provinces some of which have 50 million inhabitants and an area larger than that of the United Kingdom. Has there ever been such an experiment in politics of so staggering a size, so daring in degree? *You* have a share of responsibility for this venture in democracy six thousand miles away, at a time in the history of the world when a few days ago several Germans living 300 miles from you were imprisoned for "having listened in to a wireless programme from Moscow".

Here are some statistics. I have selected four national dailies on the day the great ship started across the Atlantic.

Columns of news and pictures devoted to the *Queen Mary* ...	20
ditto to the Russian decrees	NIL
ditto to the Indian announcement	NIL

They speak for themselves.

"How Mr. Thomas's house is furnished"; "Opera singer sings whilst her child dies"; "Are girls lured to theatres and drugged?—No"; "Husband returns after his funeral"; "A King's sister elopes with hotel porter"; "Girl's magic love potion"; "Woman on driver's lap"; "Sad birthday of eight-year-old girl—father drowned"; *etc., etc.* This is a selection of what I am asked to believe some 12 million people, adult citizens of Great Britain in the year 1936, gladly accepted as the most important news of the day on Thursday, 28th May last.

I do not believe it, and if I had to believe it I should regard the future of England and all that she stands for with some despondency. Don't get me wrong on this. I'm not a dull, humourless, academic, quasi-intelligentsia who can't appreciate the drama of a good murder trial or a drop of scandal in the luncheon coffee. But because I had something to do with a naval comedy called *The Middle Watch* that does not mean that I am unaware of the significance of the Navy as one of the instruments of Imperial Defence; and I hope the same remark applies to you.

All I ask of my papers is that they preserve a sense of proportion in their handling of the news, and, as the papers will tell me that they print most *slush* because it's "what the public wants", the remedy lies in your hands. It is my own conviction that the popular press is twenty years behind the times and that you are much more intelligent than you are supposed to be by people in editorial offices. Journalists are so close to the wood of public opinion and so costive with current business that they have little time in which to think, little time in which to note those slow but significant changes in public outlook which are the consequences of improvements in education and the manifold cultural activities of the B.B.C. Journalists are good servants but bad masters, and the same remark applies with double force to newspaper proprietors. It is essential if democracy is to be preserved that the people should preserve and develop their powers of independent and critical thought on the great issues of the day. It should be the business of a newspaper to serve its public by publishing in an objective manner the facts (news) about the subjects of the day which are significant and then—if it likes—expressing an editorial

opinion on the conclusions to be derived from those facts. The popular press of to-day does not in my judgment fulfil the first of these functions as well as it should do. The public would like to take its papers seriously, but who could take the popular press of to-day as other than a vast music-hall joke? Some papers are more ludicrous than others. No names, no pack-drill, but an examination of half a dozen national dailies and the three London evening papers will show where the slush lies deepest, and then—as I wrote above—the remedy lies with your penny. Net sales are the fiddle with which you can make Fleet Street dance to your tune.

A CRICKET NOTE.

Unfortunately there has been as little time this summer to watch cricket as there is space available to describe it. Lest readers of these pages who expect some mention of the game in our October number should be disappointed, I will use a blank half-page to say a word about a day of the match in which Surrey actually got the better of Yorkshire, if only to remove from myself any suspicion of partiality!

On the Saturday, Yorkshire had batted slowly and painfully for 315. On Monday Sandham and Squires opened the Surrey innings to a strange looking Yorkshire team, Bowes and Barber both being lame in the pavilion. The wicket was perfect, the batting good, that of Sandham rather anonymous, that of Squires delightful: his cutting was the best I have seen for years. The Yorkshire team, though their fielding was good, gave the impression of staleness: the visit to the West Indies last winter was, I am sure, a mistake. There was none of the aggressiveness which was never missing when Macaulay and Emmott Robinson were playing; the spirit seemed to be, "This Oval wicket is perfect. Without Bill we shan't get them out unless they get themselves out". In the captaincy that "tired feeling" was much in evidence. Sellers is keen and shrewd, and it is usually possible to see what he is after. But when Smailes and Hargreaves had worn the shine off the ball, his changes were Yardley and himself, surely enough to give confidence to any batsmen!

Verity was not asked to bowl until the score was 73. Sandham got himself out before lunch, and Squires, careless in an over which had produced ten runs, soon after. We hoped to see something of Fishlock, but he was bowled by Verity, and 5 wickets were down for 160. There did not seem much to come, and Yorkshire looked like having a comfortable lead when Brown joined Holmes. Holmes was beaten several times, and Brown was not too sure, but they gained confidence, and Sellers, for some inscrutable reason did not ask for the new ball until 234, when they had played themselves in. I had to leave before the score was 300, but both went on to make centuries, and Yorkshire's lack of spirit allowed two second-rate batsmen to deprive them of a fighting chance for the championship which Derbyshire well deserve.

Albert Peel.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

For more than a year before St. Paul left Ephesus he had been planning to have the churches he had founded around the Aegean perform an effective and appealing act of brotherhood to the Church at Jerusalem. Jerusalem has never been an industrial city, where one could easily earn a living. Down to the present day its chief industry is the entertaining of pilgrims and tourists. Such capital as the Jerusalem Christians had had they had consumed years before in their communistic experiment. All through the New Testament period they were "the poor saints" at Jerusalem. St. Paul knew that "money talks". We sometimes think that it speaks more eloquently to the Jew than to others; but we are all very sensitive to its utterances. The converts who had been won to Christ on both sides of the Aegean were nearly all poor. "Not many mighty, not many noble" had been called. They were labourers, small traders, and such like people. To secure from congregations made up of such people a substantial sum of money, required time and insight and tact. To accomplish it St. Paul instituted a systematic plan of giving. Members of the different churches were to lay by a small sum each week, according as the Lord had prospered them. Had envelopes only been invented then, it would be the earliest instance of the envelope system on record. The eighth and ninth chapters of Second Corinthians, which really are the concluding chapters of his four letters to that church, are devoted to directions for completing this fund. Any modern churchman who has to raise money can gain points in the psychology of the art from reading St. Paul's arguments. In money-raising, as in everything he undertook, he was a master.

G. A. Barton, *The Apostolic Age and the New Testament.*

We cannot too often remember that wherever the Puritan encountered the State it was, for him, not merely an engine of repression, but, more, an engine of repression concerned to destroy the saints of God. They knew the State, until the Toleration Act, as an instrument used to harass and attack them; it was no wonder that they came to suspect the purposes of its action.

H. J. Laski, *The Rise of European Liberalism.*

Most signally the air, which man had reckoned as his proudest conquest, is proving to be his most haunting menace. Well might the Russian peasant exclaim, after hearing a lecture by Maxim Gorky, "Yes, they have taught us to swim in the sea like fishes and to fly in the air like birds, but how to live on the earth we know not".

E. G. Selwyn, *Thoughts on Worship and Prayer.*

Christians will do well to look with clear, open eyes at the fact that in Mexico, as in Russia, a secular government, rejecting religion, has in less than two decades done more to carry out reforms congruous with the programme that Jesus read in the Nazareth synagogue than the Church has done in four hundred years.

Basil Mathews, *Shaping the Future.*

An Italian on "Englishmen and Others".

Many Englishmen, in the course of the centuries, have been known to die of bullet wounds; but there has never been a single case of a son of Albion being slain by an idea.

The metamorphosis of an Englishman into a human being would be much more than a crime against the honour and prestige of England, it would be a crime against nature—the only sort of crime that Englishmen, despite appearances, are utterly incapable of committing. It is as well for us from now on to be clear on this fundamental point: the Englishman is forbidden to be human not by the laws of his country but by the laws of God and nature.

In the whole history of England there is not a single example of an Englishman's having been transformed into a human being.

CURZIO MALAPARTE, in *The Yale Review*.

An example of a very great technical achievement with the most useful and beneficial possibilities which nevertheless indirectly threatens to impair culture, is the wireless. No one will doubt for a moment the extraordinary value of this new instrument of communication. S O S messages, music and news for the isolated in remote places, are only a few of its manifold blessings. And still, as an organ of information wireless in its everyday function means in many respects a regression to a less effective form of transmission of thought. We are here not thinking of the recognized evils of popular practice: listening-in without listening or the fatuous shiftlessness which degrades the business to a messing about with sound and thought. Apart from all these not unavoidable defects, the wireless constitutes a slower and more restricted form of knowledge-assimilation. For the pace of our time the spoken word is much too cumbersome. Reading is the higher cultural function. In reading the mind absorbs much more quickly; it is perpetually selecting, it braces itself, skips, stops to think; it exercises a thousand mental activities denied to the listener. In an article entitled "The Decline of the Written Word" an advocate of film and wireless in educational instruction predicted with glad assurance a near future in which the child would be brought up on pictures and talks. Were this prediction to come true, it would mean a tremendous stride towards barbarism. A better method of teaching youth not to think, of keeping it puerile, and of eventually boring it to death as well, could hardly be devised.

J. HUIZINGA, *In the Shadow of Tomorrow*.

In *Upton Sinclair presents William Fox* I have been interested to see the statement of that prominent film-producer's ideals. He cherishes the notion of making educational pictures for schools, colleges, churches, and homes, and has indeed already prepared apparatus for such a purpose, and with the material for a circulating library of films to rent.

Since, to say nothing of the homes to be thus supplied, there must be some forty thousand motion-picture houses already in the world, as well as perhaps half a million churches, the scope is ample. The need is no less urgent.

HAVELOCK ELLIS, *Questions of our Day*.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Rise of European Liberalism. By H. J. LASKI. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

These lectures, which argue that "the liberty of Liberalism is set in the context of property", make, we venture to say, one of the most important, because one of the most timely, contributions to the study of social and political philosophy. Some who have breathed the air of Liberalism from their youth will deem Prof. Laski unfair in accusing them of denying the liberty they cherish to the overwhelming majority of their fellow-citizens, and in saying they do not see that mankind is "ready for a new social order based on a new relation of man to man".

It may be that Prof. Laski's views have not the objectivity of the scientific historian, but there can be no doubt of the suggestiveness of his survey, not merely to political philosophers, but to those whose primary interests are religious. Let us quote one or two passages as examples:

> Slowly, but, nevertheless, irresistibly, science replaced religion as the controlling factor in giving shape to the thoughts of men. The idea of a golden age in the past, with its concomitant idea of original sin, gave way to the doctrine of progress, with its own concomitant idea of perfectibility through reason.
>
> Liberalism has usually, by reason of its origins, been hostile to the claims of churches. It has tended less perhaps to the Erastianism of Hobbes than to view religious bodies as associations like any other within the community, entitled to tolerance so long as they do not threaten the social order.

Liberalism, says Prof. Laski, "came, then, as a new ideology to fit the needs of a new world", a new world because of geographical discoveries, the breakdown of feudal economic relations, the establishment of new churches independent of Rome, new scientific inventions, printing, nationalism, and a new political theory, with its subject the relation of man to man.

But in this new world the capitalist spirit began to attain a predominant hold, and the pursuit of wealth became the chief motive of human activity. By 1563,

> the new men were in the saddle. The new terms of exploitation had been laid down. It was no longer for the new spirit to make its terms with the church. It was now the business of the church to make its terms with the new spirit.

Prof. Laski then shows how the secular State triumphed, ecclesiastical authority in the economic sphere being destroyed; toleration sprang up because persecution was a threat to property in an age when the concern of men was for orders more than for truth (here Prof. Laski is very convincing). All this at a time when reason was extending its boundaries at the expense of dogma, when the spirit of Hobbes had replaced that of the Reformers, and

> Christianity begins to be viewed in the perspective of history and geography. The effect is to make it a part of nature and not the mistress of it.

The lawyer (Cecil) class displaced the aristocrat, the churchman, and the soldier, and the secular *New Atlantis* the religious *Utopia*.

The 17th century sees the victory of utilitarianism in morals, totalitarianism in religion, constitutional government in politics:

> it begins, both consciously and on a great scale, to adapt itself to a new audience. Latin rapidly ceases to be the universal tongue of the learned; and the bourgeoisie begins to enter into their kingdom.

Religion becomes rational, even worldly. The discoveries of science gave a sense of progress, a growth of optimism, and in that atmosphere mercantilism grew. We cannot trace the argument down the years, but in the 18th century we have come to a state when men believed in religion

> on the understanding that it was kept in its proper place. By that it meant two things. It did not, firstly, propose to allow religion to interfere with the solid business of making a fortune; and it wanted, secondly, enough sanction to remain with its principles to keep the working classes in their proper place.

Adam Smith completes the evolution which began at the Reformation.

> The latter substituted the prince for the church as the source of the rules which regulate social behaviour. Locke and his school substituted Parliament for the prince as better fitted to pervade them with social purpose. Adam Smith went a stage further and added that, with minor exceptions, there was no need for Parliament to interfere at all.

No student can work through this book without learning much. We strongly recommend all our readers to tackle it.

EDITOR.

Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion. By O. S. RANKIN. Clark. 10s.

This volume of Kerr Lectures is an important contribution to the subject of which it treats. The emphasis falls on the second part of the title: the book is not a general introduction to the contents of the Wisdom books, but a series of connected studies of theological issues raised by them. Thus the first four chapters deal with theodicy and divine providence, individual responsibility, reward and retribution; the next four chapters with the origin and development of the idea of a future life in Israel; and the final chapter with the mediating "hypostasis" of Wisdom. The discussion is throughout historical and comparative and full account is taken of the most recent work, which is copious. The modern interest in the Wisdom literature is fully justified by its importance, both in intrinsic worth and also in its bearing on the rise and exact nature of early Christian doctrine.

The careful and detailed study of the origin of the idea of a future life, which is central in the book, is especially illuminative. We are glad to see that the writer dismisses the view (which has obtained currency through recent advocacy) that the conception of Sheol was relatively late, and was fostered by Yahwism in its polemic against necromancy and the cult of the dead. Dr. Rankin rightly, we think, regards the Sheol conception as primitive, and as existent side by side with "the idea of an occasional activity of the spirits of the dead". In regard to the doctrine of resurrection, more attention should have been given to the peculiar psychology which makes this doctrine so characteristic of the Jewish faith. The author

explains the lateness of the rise of any belief in real life after death by reference to (1) Yahweh's nature as a heaven-god, in contrast with earth-gods (with whom survival ideas were commonly linked): (2) Yahweh's consequent relation to nature as its creator, which prevented Him from being absorbed in mystery cults: (3) the tenacity with which the doctrine of a complete retribution within this world was held.

The balanced judgment of the author is well illustrated by the clear statements of the growth of eschatological ideas (pp. 127 ff.) and of the historical interpretation of the nature festivals through which they became capable of absorption in Yahwism. On the other hand, his account of the growth of the retribution doctrine, for which he gives "Wisdom" an unusual amount of credit, suffers in lucidity and cogency because he antedates the work of the Wisdom teachers. In fact (following the unsafe guidance of Sellin, and Gressmann) he goes so far as to say that "they influenced even the earliest of the prophets in respect of the doctrine of reward". This seems to us the reversal of the true interpretation, which regards the prophets as pioneers in this, as in so much else.

Amongst the many foreign influences affecting the growth of Wisdom ideas, and particularly the hypostatized figure of Wisdom as Yahweh's agent in creation, Dr. Rankin gives first place to Persian influences (with an admixture of Babylonian). His review of the different theories is eminently fair and will be very useful to students. Altogether, the book is a valuable one, and will take a place of its own in the serious study of an important subject.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The God Who Speaks. By B. H. Streeter. Macmillan. 5s.

Canon Streeter has made himself well-known as the apostle of reality and adventure in religion. His latest book, which consists of the Warburton Lectures delivered at intervals during the past two years, is very characteristic. He tells us how he has been concerned all his life with the "exploration of the intellectual basis of religion", but that he has come to realize the limitations which are inherent in any merely intellectual approach to the deepest problems of human life. Speculation must be supplemented by experience and the doing of the Will of God be made a condition of spiritual knowledge.

> The way to a knowledge of God will be through the reorientation of purpose and desire, and a constant rededication of the self to the highest that it knows.

With this end in view Canon Streeter discusses the divine revelation of a plan for nations and individuals as it is set forth in the Old and New Testament scriptures. His book is a fine defence and exposition of the word and vision of a Living God, and of the true way of life based upon God's guidance. In his approach to the subject Canon Streeter is obviously influenced by his experiences in connexion with the Group Movement, but this only serves to give point and reality to his discussion. He has given us in this book an admirable example of modern apologetic at its best, and it can be cordially recommended to all who would hear what God the Lord will speak.

W. B. Selbie.

The Great Galilæan Returns. By H. K. Booth. Scribners. 6s.
The Foundations of Christian Faith. By J. A. Bain. Clark. 4s.

Here are two very different books that may be put under the head of Christian apologetics. The difference between them can at least be suggested by saying that one is by an American, and the other by a Scot.

Mr. Booth, who is nothing if not up-to-date, calls his book "A Survey of the Eclipse and Re-discovery of Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom". In a very lively and well-written sketch of the whole history of Christendom he seeks to show how the main emphasis of the teaching of Jesus, as he regards it, has been constantly overlooked and must be recovered before Christianity can have its perfect work. This emphasis, he considers, is on the dominant ideal of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and the need for a transformed social order. To Mr. Booth a gospel is nothing if not a social message. The great enemy and the root of all evil is capitalism, and the only hope of the world is the re-discovery of the social message of Jesus Christ. While one has every sympathy with Mr. Booth's intentions, it is impossible to be blind to the fact that his interpretation of Christianity is hopelessly one-sided. In his polemic against acknowledged perversions of the Gospel in the history of the Church he tends always to go to the other extreme. His treatment of the Church would seem to suggest that it is little more than a society for social betterment, and the Kingdom of Heaven little more than an industrial Utopia. It is quite true, as Mr. Booth says, "with Jesus the Kingdom of God means a transformation both of the body and the soul of society". Such transformation, however, is only likely to be brought about through the prior transformation of human beings, and this surely was an equally emphasized element in the teaching of Jesus.

This comes out clearly enough in Dr. Bain's book, which deals with Christianity from the point of view of the individual rather than of the social gospel. His chief stress is on the necessity for faith in God as an intelligent dynamic, and he believes that this faith is for man as an individual, as well as for human society as a whole, the most necessary and helpful attitude. The implications of it Dr. Bain works out both from the standpoint of experience, history, and authority, and his treatment of the subject throughout is scholarly, sober, and sensible. His book is one that can be confidently commended to intelligent young people who are ready to take a little trouble in order to discover the meaning and claims of the Christian faith.

W. B. Selbie.

A Plain Man's Guide to Christianity. By the Rev. A. R. Vidler. Heinemann. 5s.

The title of this book recalls one of those two books which John Bunyan's wife brought to him as her dowry. This was *A Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven,* and the contrast between these two books is a good measure of the change which has come over the religious outlook since Bunyan's day. Mr. Vidler is a Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd at Cambridge and a strong champion of Anglo-Catholicism, but he is a liberal Catholic, as the sub-title of his book indicates, and is too intelligent and open-minded to take a merely sectarian standpoint. His book deals in the main with four great subjects—Belief in God, Belief in Christ, The Church and the Means of Grace, and The Last Things. In the first section he gives a sound defence of Christian theism in modern terms, and his treatment of the subject, brief as it is, will undoubtedly appeal to plain men and women. The second section, again, is written in the light of the generally ascertained results of modern *New Testament* criticism, and, as is usual among Anglo-Catholics, presents a view of our Lord from the incarnational rather than the redemptive standpoint. In dealing with the Church and the Means of Grace Mr. Vidler naturally takes up a definitely Anglo-Catholic position, but not in any exclusive or narrow sense. Those

who do not share his views, however, cannot but be grateful to him for his very lucid exposition of the Anglo-Catholic standpoint, especially in regard to the Sacraments and the Creeds. Coming from the quarter that it does, a book like this is full of promise, though it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the position taken up in it is only a half-way house to something bigger and brighter still.

W. B. Selbie.

The Dawn of Religion. By Eric S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

We have already commended in these columns the previous volumes of the "Great Religions of the East" series. No volume in this series is more welcome than this, written by its Editor, *The Dawn of Religion.*

The study of primitive religion has been brought into disrepute by the dogmatism of many of its most famous exponents. Students of any living religion such as Hinduism or Christianity soon find that although there is continuity between the ancient and the new the facts are too complex to be forced into the narrow mould of any theory. We can trace the development of thought; we could not have predicted it. It is only in the sphere of the pre-historic that it appears possible to plot a curve as if there were steady progress. The study of religious origins has been marked by an over-confidence possible only by the absence of those inconvenient things, historic facts. In consequence, books on so-called primitive religion often arouse impatience, for in them theories are advanced with an assurance quite unwarranted by the evidence. From such undue dogmatism this book is completely free. Dr. Waterhouse wins the confidence of his readers for he nowhere speaks of uncertainties as if they were certain, and he writes of primitive religion as one who knows himself what religion is.

It would be hard to imagine a better introduction to the study of the first phases of religion than that given in this concise and lucid book. Dr. Waterhouse makes many an illuminating reference to late survivals of early customs and ideas, and his book is thus of interest not only to those beginning the study of primitive religion but to all interested in religion at any of its stages, and not least to students of the *O.T.* The volume has a value out of all relation to its size and price. We have read it not only with interest but with profit, and we very warmly recommend it to all concerned with the nature of religion.

Sydney Cave.

Indian Thought and its Development. By Albert Schweitzer. Translated by Mrs. C. E. B. Russell. Hodder. 5s.

Albert Schweitzer's is the truly international mind. More than anyone to-day he seeks to take all knowledge to be his province. He has shown a sense of what is significant in not limiting his investigations to the philosophies of the West but taking Indian thought as well into account and presenting in his new volume an outline of its central development. The courage and persistence of Hindu speculation (for it is with Hinduism alone that he deals) make a study of it—just because it has so greatly failed—specially valuable. We have there writ large for all to read the error of "world and life negation". Dr. Schweitzer sees how the whole history of India's development from the Upanishad sages to Tagore is a commentary on the incompatibility of the *via negativa* and the life of ethical striving. Tagore, it is true, finds for himself in the Vedanta the will to ethical progress, but it is because he brings to the forest sages what he is seeking from them:

> What happens in Indian thought confirms the result of pure reflection: namely that the world-view of world and life negation has not equal justification with that of world and life affirmation and cannot enter into competition with it. . . . In measure as it becomes ethical it ceases to exist.

One of the tests of the ultimacy of Christianity, as over against its rivals, is its ethical power, and Dr. Schweitzer, while he seeks to exclude Christianity and indeed religion from his consideration, may be understood as demonstrating that contrast. He speaks at the same time rather obscurely of the coming both from the East and from the West, of a profound philosophy, "which will conquer the hearts of individuals and compel whole peoples to acknowledge its sway". We have here a valuable study which may help Indian thinkers, as well as all of us, to see more clearly some of the ultimate problems which we must never cease striving to solve.

N. Macnicol.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Dr. Buchanan Blake, who this year celebrates the Diamond Jubilee of his ministerial life, in *Light on Bible Texts* (Allenson, 3s.) makes some notes on texts from *Genesis* to *Revelation* where he suggests the *R.V.* might be improved. These are on the lines of this translation of *Isaiah* 40^3, merely transposing a comma :—

> Hark ! A voice crying,
> In the wilderness prepare the Way of the Lord.

Some of Dr. Blake's suggestions are very helpful.

We warmly commend Dr. G. A. Barton's **The Apostolic Age and the New Testament* (Oxford Press, 7s.), a fresh, readable, up-to-date New Testament Introduction. Readers will not always agree with Dr. Barton, but even his conjectures will start them off on lines of thought certain to be fruitful. He divides the period into

> 1.—30-43. Pentecost—Beginning of Paul's mission at Antioch. The Church Unconscious of Its Mission.
> 2.—42-70. Beginnings of Conscious Missionary Enterprise.
> 3.—70-150. Institutionalizing of Christianity.

The explanation of Pentecost will startle, though it will give ministers a good Whitsuntide sermon, and they will get many more as they go through the lectures. Dr. Barton gives a high place to Apollos, whom he believes to have been the author not only of *Hebrews,* but of the Birth-stories in *Luke;* he does not believe the Arabia in which Paul spent "three" years was the desert, but Aretas, with cities in which Paul preached. Dr. Barton includes Form-criticism in his suggestive survey. He provides a good bibliography (Canon Streeter's initials are transposed throughout the book) and a Chronology (Pentecost and Conversion of Paul 30 ; Q 40-47 ; M 49-60 ; first edition *Mark* 50-51, 2nd edition 68-70 ; first edition *Luke* 58-60, 2nd 61-62 ; *Acts* 62-63 ; *Heb.* 65-70 ; *Matt.* 85-90 ; *Eph.* 85-90 ; *Rev.* 90-96 ; *John* and *Epps.* 90-100).

Dr. R. E. Roberts's "Study of the Beatitudes," *The Happy Heart* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) has the same qualities as were noted in *We Go In Quest,* but the book has scarcely the same liveliness : this is perhaps due to the fact that it is overweighted with quotations and illustrations, and has too little of Dr. Roberts himself.

Christian Worship (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), a dignified and beautifully produced volume, is issued as part of the Jubilee Celebrations of Mansfield College, Oxford. In it, under the Editorship of the Principal, fourteen alumni of the College, *plus* Dr. James Moffatt, present studies of the important subject selected. Needless to say, there is much sound scholarship and clear exposition, and the volume deserves the careful attention of students. Dr. Garvie on "The Philosophy of Worship"; Drs. Wheeler Robinson, Manson, Cadman, and Dodd on the Bible period; Drs. Bartlet, Franks, Moffatt, Cadoux, and the Rev. A. G. Matthews on the history; and the Revs. E. R. Micklem, E. Shillito (a very readable essay on "The Preaching of the Word"), and K. L. Parry on various aspects of the subject; and the Principal's final chapter—a lucid survey of "The Sacraments": it is a rich feast. The contributors will not, of course, always carry readers with them, nor even each other; Mr. Parry, for example, minimizes the extent and the force of the early Puritan objection to read prayers in a way which will scarcely commend itself to Mr. Matthews, even though reference is made to him. But discussion is all to the good, and will help to atone for Congregational neglect of the subject in past days. A final essay on Congregational worship during the fifty years of Mansfield's existence might have been added with appropriateness and advantage. Forsyth is quoted (229) as saying free prayer descended from a time when the Church of believers and the worshipping congregation were identical; it cannot do its mighty work because of unbelief in a day "when the Church is the minority of the congregation". In our time we are in many places back again to the state when "the church" and "the congregation" are one and the same; what is not so certain is whether the members of the church are believers in the sense they once were.

Preachers without German who desire to taste Dr. Karl Heim's sermons are now able to do so through *The Living Fountain* (Clark, 5s.), an American translation of eleven sermons. It is significant that all the texts, with the exception of one for New Year's Eve, are from the *N.T.* This is good preaching; Dr. Heim has a gift of illustration unusual in modern German preachers.

We cannot see the purpose of M. Louis Bertrand's *The Art of Suffering* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.), now translated, with an Introduction by the Rev. C. C. Martindale. The motto is Chateaubriand's "He who is ready to die is invincible", but the writer's pre-occupation and temper are suggested in the words: "Anxiously we bend over to watch the agonies of the dying". M. Bertrand seems to delight in "agonies", though his publishers call it courage:

> He contemplates all the skeletons, all the horrors, all the miseries of life with a resolution which is as valuable as it is noble. . . . . The ugliest diseases, the fiercest wounds, are examined intrepidly.

We can only ask, *Cui bono?* Is anything to be learnt from the detailed account of the illness of Philip II of Spain or the tortures of Balthasar Gérard? The book suggests neither the objective study of the scientist nor the search for truth of the theologian; its aim seems to be neither to kindle faith nor to solve a mystery; and some of life's keenest suffering such as that of remorse and bereavement is not so much as mentioned.

Nothing that Prof. Rufus M. Jones writes could fail to be suggestive, and preachers who read *The Testimony of the Soul* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) will find many ideas for sermons, especially in the first chapters. On the whole, however, these ten lectures do not seem to have the vitality of some of the writer's previous volumes, nor do they seem to have the unity which

the title would suggest. It is well, however, that we should have an exposition of mystical religion from one who is not only in the succession of Plato and Plotinus, but also one of the great authorities on its history.

Dr. F. W. Boreham tells us that *The Passing of John Broadbanks* (Epworth Press, 5s.), the 30th volume of his essays, is the last. We cannot believe it, and expect that, like a *prima donna,* Dr. Boreham will have many a farewell appearance yet. Dr. Boreham has helped many preachers during the quarter century his essays have been issued, and this volume will have for them no less interest than its predecessors. Mr. F. W. Elwell's name has gone astray on p. 130.

Our Faith in God (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), by the Dean of St. Paul's, is the first volume of the "Diocesan Series", the succeeding volumes of which are to appear in consecutive years for use of study groups in the autumn and winter. They aim at removing the widespread ignorance of the teaching of Christianity by expounding its central affirmations in a simple and readable way. The Dean's book serves this purpose well, and is a characteristically competent piece of apologetic. Should not a list of suggestions for further reading have been added?

It is good to have an English translation of the *De Principiis* of Origen, one of the most attractive of the Fathers of the Church. The work was written in Greek, *c.* 225, and translated into Latin by Rufinus, *c.* 397. It is now rendered into English from Koetschau's text by Dr. G. W. Butterworth, with an Introduction and Notes, under the title, *Origen on First Principles* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.).

The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) contains the addresses on the problem of evil recently broadcast by the Rev. J. S. Whale. The first three discuss the four classic answers, the answer of Theism, and the Christian answer, and the fourth deals with listeners' questions. Clear and cogent, and uncompromisingly Christian.

Still another volume of the Archbishop of York's lectures in America! *Christianity in Thought and Practice* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) contains three lectures: "The Relations between Philosophy and Religion", in which the belief is expressed that the future of civilization depends on man's answer to questions concerning the personality of God and the immortality of the individual soul; "Personality in Theology and Ethics"; and "Christian Ethics in Application to Individuals and Groups", a clear statement of the Archbishop's position on the problem which to-day presses heavily on all thoughtful Christians.

Few Gifford Lectures can have been more readable and more easily understood than the Bishop of Durham's *Christian Morality: Natural, Developing, Final* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.). Dr. Henson's contention is that Christianity is the only religion competent to inspire a morality which civilized men can accept and find adequate to their needs. He examines the factors which determined the original Christian morality—the tradition of Judaism, the teaching of Jesus, and the influence of Graeco-Roman society—and goes on to show how it has been "uniquely assimilative, and for that reason uniquely capable of development". Its bearing on some of the dominant and most difficult questions of the day—sex, race, industry, the State—is then considered, with the clarity of view and forcefulness of expression which mark all Dr. Henson's writings, and the conclusion is that Christian morality is not only natural, developing, and final, but points the way to the "natural theology" which is the concern of the Gifford Lectures. A not very relevant critique of the Webbs's *Soviet Communism* is added. Much could be quoted from these vigorous chapters, but we

content ourselves with sentences expressing a view often stated in these pages, perhaps *ad nauseam* :

> Christian ministers, hard pressed to raise funds for maintaining the great machinery for religious and philanthropic work which has been built up by the zeal and sacrifice of their predecessors, are ill placed for pressing the inexorable demands of the moral law on the wealthy individuals whose financial assistance they hope to receive. . . My own observations during a fairly long ministry lead me to think that the financial obsessions of Christian churches must take rank as among the major hindrances to their spiritual influence.

Without doubt Dr. Adolf Keller's *Church and State on the European Continent* (Epworth Press, 6s., a remarkably cheap book) goes to the handiest books-of-reference shelf. To call a book of 380 pages a lecture seems absurd; indeed its only fault is that it is sometimes rather wordy. Dr. Keller has unique opportunities for gathering information, and he has used them well; we cannot imagine a volume that could be of more service to the student of religion on the Continent at the present time. It may be there is little in the book that is new, but nowhere else is the information, covering many countries and Churches, gathered together. Dr. Keller begins by describing the ideas underlying the continental revolutions; he goes on to explain the different relationships existing between Church and State, the varying policies of the revolutionary States toward the Church, and the reaction of the Churches to those policies. Russia, Germany, Austria, Spain, Italy: if the reader wishes to know how the State and the Church regard each other in these and other lands—let him read this remarkable book.

The Bishop of Birmingham introduces the papers in an important volume, *The Church in the 20th Century* (Macmillan, 15s.), "The Church" being the Church of England, and all the contributors being Anglicans. Most of them are either "Modern Churchmen" or "Liberal Evangelicals", though Anglo-Catholicism is represented by Dr. F. L. Cross. The other contributors are Dr. Norman Sykes ("The Ideal of a National Church")—clear and learned but unconvincing, Dr. Major ("Towards Prayer Book Revision"), Dr. Dearmer ("Public Worship and the Creeds"), Canon Guy Rogers ("Intercommunion"), Canon Raven ("Interchange of Pulpits"), Sir A. T. Wilson ("The Church and Secular Life"), Dr. Douglas White ("Religion and Sex"), Dr. Elliott-Binns ("Evangelicalism and the Twentieth Century"), and the Editor, the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey (*"Nova et Vetera"*). Our readers will do well to read the volume.

Lord Conway of Allington's *A Pilgrim's Quest for the Divine* (Muller, 10s. 6d.) is the account of a search for spiritual truth. Traveller and explorer, Lord Conway has seen nature in many forms, and his quest for the truth at the heart of the universe is illustrated by what nature has said to him. Lord Conway finds in a four-dimensional universe the explanation of many of life's perplexities, and his conclusions are far from orthodox Christianity. Asked what in a universe of four dimensions is the equivalent or substitute for Redemption, he answers :

> Your ideas of Redemption, of the forgiveness of sins, of a Resurrection of the body, and of a life in a world to come, are all based upon the idea that the three-dimensional world of our senses is an enduring world and not a mere succession of lightning flashes. Time is an illusion. Eternity here and now is the only solid fact. What we do in time is eternal. It admits of no forgiveness, it awaits neither

> Judgment nor Resurrection, for all that ever was still is and judgment is simultaneous with deed.

Man in this life makes himself a complete crystal, perhaps an imperfect crystal, but still complete; and

> if we determine to live in an atmosphere of beauty and goodness we shall find the divine gifts quietly awaiting our acceptance.

Dr. W. B. Riley's *Pastoral Problems* (Oliphants, 6s.) is very American, very "cover to cover-y" and anti-modernist, and not always accurate (p. 171). And although ministers might learn something from its pages, they will often be irritated by the bounce and bluster, and by such remarks as the advice that at funerals "the talk should never exceed fifteen minutes unless the person is of great importance"!

Dr. G. S. Marr's "Historical Survey", *Sex In Religion* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is as disappointing as it is pretentious; from a man of Dr. Marr's qualifications—he has degrees in Literature, Divinity, and Medicine—we had a right to expect something much more scholarly and helpful. Dr. Marr has collected from many lands and many writers an amazing number of facts—but in an indiscriminating kind of way, and the reader feels that they are altogether undigested. He is extremely susceptible to fashions—witness his deference to Flaubert and Freud, but by no means up-to-date. His history has a second-hand look about it, while the ponderous sermonic manner is repelling; with such a tremendous subject there are far too many platitudes, such as:

> That many good things resulted from the Reformation, no one can deny, although the rending of the seamless garment of the Church was much to be deplored.

Dr. W. A. White gives his Salmon Lectures, *Twentieth Century Psychiatry* (Chapman & Hall, 10s. 6d.), the sub-title, "Its Contribution to Man's Knowledge of Himself"; we cannot think, however, that either the man in the street or the student will learn much either about psychiatry or about himself from these pages. Freudian jargon and unassimilated Whitehead make by no means a lucid mixture, and often we have thought "Words! Words!" after sentences like this one:

> Following such an act we find depersonalization symptomatology in evidence for an indefinite time and then we can see the building up of new integrations, which are an effort at cure, let us say on the one hand, and on the other an effort at avoiding certain too-painful and unendurable realizations.

The second of the three lectures, "The Social Significance of Psychiatry", is easily the best, though it is sometimes evident in the other two that if Dr. White could simplify his style and vocabulary he has something useful to say: the reference on p. 79 to the psychological factors involved in the birth control and sterilization movements, and the constant plea that mental facts should not be isolated from the physical conditions and social environment, suggest the kind of help Dr. White might have given.

The fact that it is written in the American idiom should not prevent English students from reading Dr. H. C. Link's **The Return to Religion* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.), one of the sanest books by a psychologist which has come our way. Dr. Link was brought up in a religious home, but became "emancipated" during his college course, and, like most of his fellow-students, an agnostic contemptuous about religion. As a psychologist he has had to deal with some 4,000 people in the last fifteen years, and as a result of his experience he has returned to religion, having been convinced

of its need and value for himself and for his patients. In this book he shows, with illustrations from his case-books, how religion and attachment to churches can assist to fuller, happier life; and on the home, education, and social planning he has many wise things to say.

The Fernley-Hartley Lecture, by Sir Josiah Stamp, is now published under the title *Motive and Method in a Christian Order* (Epworth Press, 6s.). While all the book deserves the careful attention of readers, it is likely that many will begin at the end, with the Appendix on "Social Credit"—a short but devastating summary. Dr. Stanley Jones's "enviably facile way" of dealing with economic problems is mercilessly analysed, with the aid of an "Economic Canon of the New Testament", in which Sir Josiah has collected and classified all *N.T.* passages dealing with economics. Sir Josiah argues that

> Christian teaching, so valuable in the realm of motive, gives little or no guidance upon system and method.

We trust ministers especially will work through Sir Josiah's pages; if they do they may be saved from irritating hearers, as they do more often than they realize, by the glib way in which they "solve" business problems. The "Conclusion", addressed directly to preachers, is full of mature wisdom.

The first word about Prof. J. Huizinga's "diagnosis of the spiritual distemper of our time", *In the Shadow of Tomorrow* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) must be appreciation of his son's very readable translation. Although he denies he is a pessimist, Prof. Huizinga has been greatly influenced by Spengler:

> Delusion and misconception flourish everywhere. . . . The world is filled with hate and misunderstanding. . . . The gods of our time, mechanization and organization, have brought life and death. They have wired up the whole world, established contact throughout, created everywhere the possibility of co-operation, concentration of strength, and mutual understanding. At the same time they have trapped the spirit, fettered it, stifled it.

With gentle irony which does not conceal intense earnestness Prof. Huizinga discusses various aspects of modern life. He pokes fun at fashions in words and ideas—such as "the domination of the concept 'mythos' ":

> The next addition to the collection of intellectually fashionable words will doubtless be "existential". I can see it springing up on all sides. Before long it will have landed with the public at large. When, in order to convince one's audience of profundity, one has said "dynamic" long enough, it will be "existential".

Altogether a thought-provoking survey; a misprint on p. 43.

Principal J. H. Nicholson's **Education and Modern Needs* (Nicholson & Watson, 4s. 6d.) is an important book, largely because it is so timely. It deals with a multitude of questions, but not one of them remote from the life of the community in the present day. Mr. Nicholson has travelled widely with his eyes open and with his mind open; and he is concerned about the state of the world to-day. In education—and he gives an admirable outline of education in England—we have to rebuild from the rock bottom. If we are to continue to believe in democratic self-government, we must accept its implications—

> Freedom of thought and freedom of feeling; faith in the mature judgment of ordinary men and women, and the kind of education that will bring it to maturity.

In reaching this conclusion, Mr. Nicholson makes many wise observations about the totalitarian conception of the State; education for industry, for citizenship, for leisure; broadcasting; and numerous other matters. All of which may serve to suggest that his book does not allow the reader's mind to slumber.

Though R. H. Hutton gets a wrong initial and the book falls off in a final chapter which is often trite and commonplace, Mr. Basil Mathews's **Shaping the Future* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) is so splendidly stimulating that we wish it could get into the hands of all young people. Very skilfully Mr. Mathews presents the world of to-day in all its ferment and opportunity; with apt illustrations drawn from all quarters of the earth he portrays the need for the Christian revolution. The need is for dedicated spirits who shall venture forth employing all the means offered by these modern days in the service of the Kingdom of God. The material is plastic; it is for Christians to shape it.

"Community" is the catchword of the moment, and the Rev. B. C. Plowright has caught it badly. He has all the jargon at the end of his pen, and his *Rebel Religion* (Allenson, 5s.) has all the appearances of terminological indigestion. We have tried in vain to unravel some of his sentences, and in other cases, where the meaning is clear there are some strange mixtures of metaphor:

> The final creed of the Fascist may be described as discontinuous dynamism, meaning thereby that the instinctive forces well up in community, but that there is no connecting thread of purpose between one stage or level of community and the next. At bottom it is a fatalistic conception of community.

Or to take a shorter one:

> men are unemployed because it does not pay a certain group or class so to do.

Mr. Plowright says that his sentences are written semi-automatically,

> due to some years of steady, deliberate training in fitting words to ideas.

If his ideas are to get home, he must take conscious control and simplify both his style and his vocabulary. It can be done, witness the last chapter and crisp sentences like "The Church was like a doctor who catches a disease from his patient". But we imagine Mr. Plowright is writing so much and so quickly that there has been no leisure for simplification. His book, timely as it is, therefore fails to help as it might have done on a subject where help and guidance are urgently needed—the function of religion in a world dominated by new conceptions of the individual and the State.

Those who have read Mr. L. A. Fenn's contributions to our pages will open his *Democracy and Revolution* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) with interest. It surveys the political world of to-day, seeing Fascism not as the deliberate creation of wicked men, but as the consequence of our economic system. Real and enduring democracy cannot be obtained without economic equality, and that involves the social ownership of the means of life. Such ownership can only be

> inaugurated by the victory of the workers in the class struggle.

The paramount issue is spiritual freedom,

> the right and opportunity of the ordinary man to do what he feels to be right, and to say what he deems to be true, none daring to make him afraid.

Mr. Fenn will stimulate though he does not satisfy.

The Rev. Malcolm Spencer invariably affects us in the same way; we are moved by the spirit in which he writes, in keen sympathy with his aims, and in doubt about the particular steps he desires Christians and the Christian Church to take. *Economics and God* (S.C.M., 4s. & 2s. 6d.) continues the argument of *Building on Sand,* and again a Christian searchlight plays effectively on the modern economic system. We are with Mr. Spencer every time against the defender of the present social and economic system, whether he be an active defender or one who passively acquiesces in it, accepting its profits without query. With proposals for the development of craftmanship we equally sympathize, and with Mr. Spencer's reiterated and urgent demand that the Christian conscience must be ever sensitive, the Christian intellect ever active. But, despite the air of precision, there seems a lack of concreteness about many of the proposals. Can the Christian avoid entanglement and escape compromise with the system he deplores? If he wants to make provision for his family, what is he to do with his savings? Entrust them to the banks, of which Mr. Spencer rightly says such hard things? Invest them to the best of his ability in industrial concerns over which he has little control? Or what? Mr. Spencer is doing good service in making Christians face up to the present situation: it is perhaps unreasonable to demand that he shall supply answers as well as ask questions.

The last contributor to the "If I Were Dictator" series is Mr. C. E. M. Joad, who finds on attempting his task that it so cuts across his fundamental convictions that he has to entitle his effort, *The Dictator Resigns* (Methuen, 3s. 6d.). To mix the metaphors, Mr. Joad trots out all the bees in his bonnet—the country-side, liquor and dress regulations, euthanasia—and has his usual sneers at religion while claiming to accept the teaching of Christ (Joad's version). As many people continually crave for approval, he would have professional praise-givers; the medical profession and hospitals would be nationalized, the Zoo abolished, the killing of animals forbidden. With many of Mr. Joad's proposals we are in agreement, as we are with his belief in liberty: the arrogance with which he writes will, however, offend many readers, and certainly will not incline people to give him a vote when the Dictatorship is vacant.

We wish the Freudians would analyse themselves to discover what makes them so foolishly extravagant in their views and so preposterous in their obsessions. But that is the one thing they seem unable to do; when Dr. Edwin Glover, the author of *The Dangers of Being Human* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) explains his vote in the Election of 1935 he finds no Freudian reasons for it. The book, which consists in the main of broadcast addresses, is marked by the same characteristics as the author's *War, Sadism and Pacifism;* he is cynical about the League, critical of the Peace Ballot, and behind all rational behaviour finds something primitive and instinctive. There are indications, especially in the discussion of the education of the young child, that Dr. Glover might have had something useful to say had he not caught the Freudian bug, but the tenor of his book may be gauged from such passages as:

> The moral to be drawn is of course that no one should be allowed within five miles of any Foreign Office who cannot pass a matriculation examination on the folk-lore of the savage. Only when we understand the primitive laws governing the relations of individuals and groups may we hope for sane or successful diplomacy.

Dr. Fedor Stepun's *The Russian Soul and Revolution* (Scribners, 6s.) is the work of a Russian Protestant now teaching in Germany, a member

of the same group as Berdyaev. A menshevik, in the War Office during Kerenski's *régime*, he was for a long time leader of the Moscow theatre, but was afterwards exiled. He sees in the Russian countryside

> the tension between barbarism and piety as the fundamental law of the Russian soul.

In Russia barbarism is always combined with

> true practical piety, joyful self-sacrifice, and heroic courage,

but he sees in the events of March, 1918, the fulfilment of de Maistre's prophecy (1829):

> Russia is like a frozen corpse, which will pollute the air frightfully when it thaws out.

The sketch of the recent history of Russia is informing; it ends with the hope that men of knowledge will regain power, and

> reconcile the Christian truth which Russia betrayed, the humanistic freedom which Russia never made its own, and the socialist righteousness which was suffocated by its birth in blood because it was cut off from God and freedom.

Prof. R. B. Mowat's *Europe in Crisis* (Arrowsmith, 3s. 6d.) is a narrative of events from the assumption of the German Chancellorship by Hitler. It is, on the whole, very sympathetic to the German position.

Young India has turned to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru for leadership, and this, and not merely the fact that he is President of Congress, gives great importance to his views. *India and the World* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) contains recent essays, though the volume opens with the Presidential Address to Congress in 1929. Perhaps most important of all the contents of the volume is the section headed "Indian Problems", in which Mr. Nehru answers the queries—succinct and pertinent—of the India Conciliation Committee. Very depressing indeed the answers are:

> You must not think that in the India Act we are getting some democratic instrument which can be developed into something better. . . . the India Act does not in any way meet the need for an intermediate period of transition. Under the India Act a wider electorate is created, and that is a desirable thing, but it is the only desirable thing in the Act.

Students of the problem of India would do well to read these papers.

Mr. Charles Muir's *Justice in a Depressed Area* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), though it deals specially with Tyneside, is of far more than local interest. Its writer is a Barrister who has had long experience of the administration of justice at Tyneside. He shows how frequently those in charge have knowledge neither of the industry with which much litigation is concerned, nor of working class life. He shows, too, how the respectable, self-reliant, independent working man always comes off worst: the rich man and the Company, able to afford popular counsel and expert witnesses, and the pauper litigant, alike have an advantage over him. The proposals which Mr. Muir makes for reform deserve the consideration of the Lord Chancellor and of the Government.

Mr. E. Stuart Bates's *Inside Out* (Blackwell, 21s.) is invariably contemptuous in its references to missionaries; thus we learn of "the ignorance, the greed, the vulgarity, and the hypocrisy of the U.S.A. missionaries" (in Korea). His "Introduction to Autobiography" is, however, so unusual in its method that it will certainly hold the reader, even though he will not always accept as authentic the autobiographies which satisfy

Mr. Bates's scrutiny. In compiling the work the author has drawn on 410 books,

> written in all, in six languages which I understand, five others which I misunderstand, and 12 more in some translation or other. The other 2,531 languages I leave for the present.

Mr. Bates classifies his writers under (*a*) The first seven years, (*b*) Growing up, (*c*) Adventure, (*d*) Poor Folk, (*e*) Business Men, (*f*) Poets. They come from many countries; as we read we are conscious that the world has certainly made some progress in the course of the years, and not least in the conditions of life on shipboard. Perhaps the best story is that of the English skipper left in the lurch by the wind when beating into harbour; asked why he was swearing he replied:

> That's a fine thing, for God Almighty to give a leading wind to a Dutchman, and let His own countrymen be left on a lee shore.

In a pleasant but unhappily indexless book Sir Edward Boyle has gathered together ten *Biographical Essays, 1790-1890* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.). The longest are *"Le Génie du Christianisme"* and "The *Italienische Reise* of Goethe", but perhaps the best, alike in form and content, are those on Samuel Rogers (has anybody ever studied Rogers's life from the Nonconformist angle?) and Harriet Martineau. The other essays deal with Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo's Oratory, Dr. Johnson and Sir John Hawkins, Paoli, Byron's Funeral, and Christina Rossetti.

Although the method entails some repetition, the Rev. R. D. Middleton's *Magdalen Studies* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) makes fascinating reading. It sketches the lives of ten Magdalen men—M. J. Routh, J. R. Bloxam, F. Bulley, Wm. Palmer, Roundell Palmer, J. B. Mozley, Henry Best, R. W. Sibthorp, Bernard Smith, and H. R. Bramley. Most of them were Tractarians, and some of them joined the Church of Rome: Routh, who lived to his hundredth year, is the most picturesque of them, Roundell Palmer perhaps the one whose life had most influence.

If readers wish to test their general knowledge they should write down the names of the subjects of Lord Moynihan's fascinating lecture, *Truants* (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.), "those who deserted medicine and yet triumphed". Most of us would start confidently with Sir Thomas Browne, and Goldsmith, Conan Doyle and Oliver Wendell Holmes, but how many of us would remember Robert Bridges and Thomas Campion, Smollett and Schiller? The long list also includes Rabelais and Clemenceau, Robert Boyle and John Locke, Linnaeus and Huxley, Dr. Jameson and Lord Finlay, Marat and Sun Yat Sen, W. G. Grace and David Livingstone, "one of the few great Victorians whose glory time has in no degree diminished".

Mr. Andreas Latzko's well-translated *Lafayette* (Methuen, 18s.) is a long book, but it never palls. This is in part due to the fact that the life of "the hero of two nations" was packed with adventure, but only in part, for the writer has done his work very skilfully. A General in America at 21, a fighter for freedom in his own country and often the dupe of cleverer men, the victim of a long imprisonment, and then after long years appearing as a ghost in his two countries, to the delight of Americans and the dismay of Frenchmen, Lafayette's story still stirs. His wife's devotion and courage fully equalled his own, and we are glad that Mr. Latzko recognizes the part she played.

Mr. Arthur Bryant does not seem so happy in *The American Ideal* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.) as in some of his previous books: he does not seem to get beneath the skin of Americans as he does in the case of some English-

men. The book is about men who have contributed to the making of America—Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Page, Emerson and Whitman, Alan Seeger and Vachel Lindsay. Lincoln and Roosevelt are easily the best essays; those on the literary figures are perfunctory and commonplace, that on Page a mere *réchauffé* of well-known facts. Mr. Bryant handles Wilson very unfairly.

Like Thirlwall's *History of Greece,* Mr. J. C. Thirlwall's *Connop Thirlwall: Historian and Theologian* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) is heavy at the start; after the first few chapters it becomes much more readable and interesting, in part perhaps because we knew little about Thirlwall except that he wrote the *History*. After beginning to read law and translating Schleiermacher, Thirlwall returned to Cambridge, took Orders, and translated Niebuhr. In 1833 he supported the demand for admission of Dissenters to the Universities, and this cost him his tutorship. Lord Brougham immediately presented him to the rectory of Kirby Underdale, near York, and in the five years which elapsed before he became Bishop of St. David's the *History of Greece* was written. The bishop's eleven Charges constitute his contribution to the history of the Church during the next 30 years—he resigned in 1874 shortly before his death—during which time he obtained a great reputation for learning, the fearless expression of his opinions, and sarcasm. He was often a solitary figure on the Episcopal Bench, and often a solitary figure in his diocese, for his clergy were afraid of his tongue. Mr. Thirlwall has done his work well, and has enriched his book by letters from Carlyle and Monckton Milnes.

Admirers of Lord Knutsford will rejoice to be reminded of their hero's achievement in Mr. John Gore's memoir *Sydney Holland: Lord Knutsford* (Murray, 7s. 6d.), even though it contains comparatively little not included in the autobiography and Mr. Langton's *The Prince of Beggars*. Mr. Gore does, however, let us see Holland in the home and at play as well as in the hospital, and so enables us to picture the whole man. Even those to whom shooting and stalking are an abomination cannot but feel the thrill of Holland's article "A Stalking Reminiscence", and all sportsmen will rejoice to read again Mr. Bernard Darwin's "A Crowded Hour", a sketch of Holland at golfing exercise.

Portrait of T. E. Lawrence (Cape, 8s. 6d.) is from Mr. Vyvyan Richards, a contemporary of Lawrence at Jesus College, Oxford, and subsequently a close friend. The book contains little that is new to those who know what has been written by and about Lawrence, but there are some first-hand impressions of the Oxford days that are of value. To Mr. Richards there are no warts; the special angle from which he views his hero may be understood from the sub-title, "The Lawrence of *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*".

Not long ago we reviewed a *Life* of Sir Robert Armstrong Jones, the father of English orthopædic surgery. *My Life and Work* (Scribners, 12s. 6d.) is the autobiography of his opposite number in Vienna, Dr. Adolf Lorenz, now an octogenarian. Born in poverty, Dr. Lorenz almost became a priest owing to the fact that his uncle was a Benedictine monk in a Carinthian monastery, of which he became Abbot. Dr. Lorenz writes very racily about his training, his work on "dry surgery", and his rise to a fame which brought him patients in America and other parts of the world. His hobby was in his house, to which he gives the chapter "Lorenz Hall or Bust!" Like others of his non-advertising profession, he managed to get a good deal of publicity. The chapters dealing with the War and its aftermath present a vivid picture of losses and hardships endured by professional men in Austria.

We are not enamoured of Herr Emil Ludwig's interview method of biography, but Masaryk is such an attractive subject that *Defender of Democracy* (Nicholson & Watson, 15s.) conquers its form. That Masaryk had been throughout his long life an omnivorous reader, that he was a man of "absolute integrity", and forward looking even in his eighties, was well known, but his great interest in religion and theology—the *alpha* and *omega* of Herr Ludwig's sketch—has not been so generally recognized : it reveals him as one of those "practical mystics" who move mountains. It is interesting to learn that some of the ex-President's writings on religion are to be published. Herr Ludwig drew from Masaryk his views on sundry political activities during his long career, as well as on the state of democracy in Europe. Through all the cross-examination Masaryk remained shrewd and unperturbed, making many pregnant observations :

> An American author, such as Mencken, may write a caricature of democracy; but even that exploit is democratic.
>
> I am against mechanical contraceptives. I have been appalled by some of the things doctors have told me on the subject. . . . If there were a rule that, on an average, men should marry about 28 and women at about 24, that would be a helpful provision both from the eugenic and demographic standpoints.
>
> The world likes to be deceived : therefore let it not be deceived.
>
> I figure myself as God's workman, and that I am working out His plan. [The whole paragraph, p. 278, is good and should be studied.] . . . Without belief in Providence, without belief in an ordered universe, I could not live, nor even work for the community. I cannot say exactly by what Power, but I feel that there is a Power which drives me onwards. The logic of events is construed after the events have happened.

The translation leaves something to be desired : what, for example, is "toploftical"?

It is safe to say that all most British people remember to-day about Baroness von Suttner is that she wrote the novel *Lay Down Your Arms*. Miss C. E. Playne has done well, therefore, to remind us of the life of one who played no small part in the fight for peace. Her *Bertha von Suttner* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) begins with her heroine's birth in Prague in 1843, her father being a Field-Marshal. When Bertha "came out", she showed her strength of character by refusing to marry the rich widower of 52 approved by her mother. There were sundry other affairs of the heart, including an engagement to Prince Wittgenstein, who, like Bertha, thought of a musical career, but he died at sea. She finally married secretly Baron Arthur von Suttner, to whose younger sisters she had become governess, and they had a "nine years' honeymoon" in the Caucasus, during which they both began to write. It was not until 1889 that *Lay Down Your Arms* appeared, and thenceforth its author was active in the work for peace. Not the least interesting pages of the book are concerned with Alfred Nobel, whose Secretary Bertha almost became, and whose prize she received in 1905, and with W. T. Stead. After 1889 the story becomes a history of the peace movement (some slips on p. 184) and of the Baroness's worldwide activities. She was fortunate in that she died just before the outbreak of War in 1914.

"T. P."—Mr. T. Pellatt—has in *Boys in the Making* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) given us a lively and provocative *apologia pro vita sua*. While yet a boy he determined to be a schoolmaster. A first in the History Schools at Oxford was followed by a spell of teaching in Lahore and at Marlborough, and then began the preparatory school, Durnford, which he made famous.

Most of Mr. Pellatt's boys went to Eton, and he is Éton's champion; he does not mince words about some of the other public schools, especially in regard to the wangling of entrance examinations. Always he is outspoken, whether it be about parents or Shakespeare, Shaw or specialists. There are lots of good stories, some unconvincing history, and politics without the slightest appeal to us, but there is life and freedom in the book just as there was life and freedom at Durnford, and, regrettable in a schoolmaster's work—misprints on pp. 221, 238, 256.

Nelson's Books of Reference are extremely useful, and the *Biographical Dictionary* (5s.), with its 6,000 biographies and a short dictionary of mythology, should certainly be of service. In a volume which claims to be "up-to-date", it is unfortunate that the title-page itself is undated.

The Migration of Culture (Blackwell, 5s.) contains two more essays from Dr. Rendel Harris's fertile pen. In them he produces evidence that Central and South America were colonized by the Egyptians, by Egyptian Celts, and by the Basques. As ingenious as ever, Dr. Harris goes on to show from British place-names that the Basques engaged in the fishing and the salt trades.

The Sir Halley Stewart Lecture for 1935 is now published under the title *Scientific Progress* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.). The lectures are by Sir James Jeans, Sir William Bragg, Prof. E. V. Appleton, Prof. E. Mellanby, Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, and Prof. Julian Huxley, and they are as interesting to read as they were to hear. Sir William Bragg's "The Progress of Physical Science" and Prof. Mellanby's "Progress in Medical Science" are excellent examples of the popularization of modern science.

"Abominable"; "insolent"; "vile"; "hypocritical"; "nauseous"; "dirty"; "disgraceful": not a bad set of epithets to be culled from a single paragraph in the writings of a scientific historian! Sir Charles Oman's *The Sixteenth Century* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) contains some of the writer's *parerga,* and sometimes the essays, entertaining as they are, make us wish that the shoemaker had stuck to his last, for it is doubtful whether the vigour of the style compensates for the loss of the accuracy that we have a right to expect from one in Sir Charles's position. But if there are mistakes and dates all awry there is much we can learn from these animated pages, not the least interesting of which are given to a study of the occult.

Mr. W. F. Reddaway's *A History of Europe, 1715-1814* (Methuen, 16s.) is one of the eight volumes in Methuen's "History of Medieval and Modern Europe", three of which have already appeared. The first thing that must be said about it is that the four Introductory Chapters give a clear account of the background: although the style is far different there is something about the chapters reminiscent of Macaulay's famous Chapter III. In summarizing a continent's history during an eventful century Mr. Reddaway has no easy task, but students will, we think, find his survey helpful. Frequently, with a further century's history behind mankind, we find ourselves pondering some of Mr. Reddaway's *obiter dicta* and some of those he quotes. How far are we prepared to say to-day that "Europe is quiet when France has need of rest", or to accept Loyola's statement, "No enemy is so dangerous as having none"? Bibliographies are given to each chapter, and there are 17 maps.

Scholars are already much in the debt of Mr. S. E. Morison, the historian of New England, and that debt is considerably increased by *The Puritan Pronaos* (Oxford & Harvard Presses, 16s.), one of the most fascinating books of the quarter. These "Studies in the Intellectual Life of New England in the 17th Century" are written with a great background

of knowledge, but their style makes them entertaining reading. Mr. Morison shows us the beginnings of education in New England—Harvard, elementary and grammar schools; describes the printing and bookselling activities of the people and their libraries; and surveys the theological, historical, and political literature, the verse, and the scientific interests of the times (with an interesting excursion on witchcraft at Salem). He points out that in 1645 there was one University-trained man to every 40 families, and that while the conversation and interest of the time were primarily theological, the New England Puritans had a far wider culture than is generally recognized. All his contentions Mr. Morison supports by contemporary evidence, sometimes in an amusing fashion: we wonder how many readers would fix the correct writers' names to four passages he quotes—by Thomas Shephard, Lancelot Andrewes, John Donne, and Urian Oates.

Mr. Ronald Matthews's *English Messiahs* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) tells the stories of six "English Religious Pretenders": they are the Quaker James Nayler, a lovable character despite his eccentricities; Joanna Southcott; Richard Brothers (1757-1824); John Nichols Tom (1799-1838); and H. J. Prince and J. H. Smyth-Pigott of the "Abode of Love". The sketches suggest how easy it is for men and women to delude themselves, and how speedily self-delusion grows once it has begun. Mr. Matthews has successfully carried out the ingenious plan which came to him. There is material for other volumes of the same kind.

It has long been known that Mrs. Eddy borrowed freely from other writers, and notably from a selection published in 1899 under the title *Philosophic Nuggets*. In *Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel* (Watts, 5s.) the Rev. W. M. Haushalter argues, with an abundant supply of evidence in parallel columns, that the basis of Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health* was Francis Lieber's *The Metaphysical Religion of Hegel,* a document which is not only printed but given in facsimile. It is Mrs. Eddy's reiterated claim that her writings owe nothing to anybody, except to the Bible, which makes these continued discoveries significant.

Mr. Arthur Stanley, the compiler of "The Bedside Book" and "The Fireside Book", has given us a new anthology, *The Testament of Man* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.) "representing man's interpretation of the world according to his higher nature". Perhaps the best compliment we can pay Mr. Stanley is to say that we picked the volume up in the small hours just before going to bed, and it detained us an unconscionable time—and we see ourselves turning to it often in the future. Beginning with the Euphrates and with sun-worship the survey only ends with our own day.

All ministers must have on their shelves Dr. J. R. Fleming's **The Highway of Reading* (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.). Its title scarcely indicates the fact that it is "a help to the right choice of books". Ministers are often asked to recommend books, and here is the help they need. It is amazing how much Dr. Fleming has managed to get into 120 pages: devotional reading and the ancient classics, history and theology, Shakespeare and Milton, the Renaissance and the Victorian Age, foreign and American masterpieces, and even libraries and periodical literature—about all these he has sound counsel to give.

We are glad that some of Dr. W. T. Davison's contributions to periodicals have been collected in *Mystics and Poets* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). After a paper on "The Myths of Plato", the other articles deal with Plotinus, Dante, Wordsworth, and Browning. A pleasing memoir by Dr. W. F. Howard is prefixed, and "Tributes" by Dr. Tasker and the Revs. W. W. Holdsworth and R. S. Armsby.

Much was written at the time of Sir William Watson's death about the long neglect of his poetry, a view that was expressed by a contributor in our own pages many years ago. In his own *Apologia* Watson says:

> what dues soe'er be mine,
> Of fame or of oblivion, Time the just,
> Punctiliously assessing, shall award.

To assist "Time and the just" Sir William before his death made the selection now published—*The Poems of Sir William Watson, 1878-1935* (Harrap, 7s. 6d.), a volume of 300 pages. What Time's award will be we do not venture to predict. To us Watson rarely seems to *sing,* though often he pleases. The aptness of his epithets and the epigrammatic nature of his verse, while they often win admiration, do not suggest spontaneity, but rather the midnight oil. Of lyrical poetry there is little, of didactic much—and very good of its kind, though running to the ornate rather than to the simple. Occasionally our feelings are stirred, as with "The Soul of Rouget de Lisle" or "On Being Styled Unpatriotic", and we can share the satire on contemporary poetry in "A Recipe"; but the sweet music of a Shelley or Keats must not be looked for. Of noble emotion in dignified verse there is much.

If sometimes the language is a shade too opulent, the dominant impression left by a perusal of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's essays *At Home and Abroad* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) is a feeling of regret that he gave to politics gifts that were so obviously meant for letters. Mr. MacDonald knows, with Dean Stanley, both "the inestimable advantages of foreign travel" and that "there's no place like home". It is perhaps the deep love of his home country and his "ain folk" which is the most significant thing in these sketches, which show that the ex-Premier has a seeing eye, deep insight, and a sympathetic spirit. Love of the moor and the sea, of the path ahead and the open road, does not conflict with a love of books and people, and the result is a delightful collection of essays, pleasant in format, too, though "Ainger" has gone wrong on p. 75 and an accent on p. 78.

The "pen-pictures" which make up Mr. Mark Channing's *Indian Mosaic* (Harrap, 8s. 6d.) have the quality of fine etchings, and we commend the book to all who want to understand India and the thought of the East. Mr. Channing arrived in India with a soldier's contempt for the civilian and a white man's scorn for the superstitions of the East. Duty took him to many parts of India and brought him into contact with men of many religions, castes, and occupations. Gradually his sense of superiority was undermined and his prejudices removed; experience of the uncanny got beneath his skin, and his contact with a wise *guru* and with *Yoga* finally removed his scoffing unbelief. Mr. Channing has given us a book that is at once readable and instructive.

Mr. R. Churchill's *I Commit to Your Intelligence* (Dent, 3s. 6d.)—"A Constructive Guide for Young People in the matters of Sex and Religion"—leaves us quite baffled, and we cannot imagine what boys of adolescent age will make of it. Mr. Churchill seems to have crammed into the book all he has ever thought of, and then peppered it from his commonplace book. Masturbation and the Sermon on the Mount, Psychotherapy and Redemption, exposition of the Parables and discussion of the Sacraments and Social Service—they are all here, not, of course, without good stuff, but for adolescent boys?

Dr. E. G. Braham's *Psychology and the Child* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) may serve as an introduction to child psychology for Sunday School

teachers. It covers a great deal of ground—too much, and there is a dogmatism about it that we hope teachers will not catch when they are learning from its suggestions.

Dr. J. W. Skinner's *Youth on Fire* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) contains 23 addresses to boys by the Headmaster of Culford School—and very good they are, though Headmasters should read their proofs carefully—we noticed "superiority" spelt very strangely.

If there should be books of children's addresses, they should be like the Rev. S. H. Price's *The Whispering Gallery* (Clark, 2s.), which contains 29 addresses in 100 pages : they will give ministers ideas which they can themselves work up into effective talks.

The Rev. McEwan Lawson's *Yarns of Valour* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) contains seven missionary stories intended for leaders of boys' organizations, with notes and questions for discussion.

Miss Vera Barclay's *Jane Will You Behave* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.), a sequel to the "Joc and Colette" books, is a story of a holiday camp, from which campers may learn a good deal.

Many who heard Mrs. J. B. Gotts speak will be grateful to her husband for gathering together *Talks! Mostly to Women—Sometimes to Men* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.), the profits from which are to be devoted to the Deaconess work in which Mrs. Gotts was so interested. Quite apart from their value as a memorial volume, the talks are excellent examples of what addresses to women should be—bright, alert, practical.

A Prayer for My Son (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is one of Mr. Hugh Walpole's slighter works, but it is in some ways as powerful as anything he has written. The wrapper speaks of his "customary mingling of beauty and terror", and that is not a bad description of this book. Mr. Walpole's evil old men will make an impressive gallery, and the portrait of Colonel Fawcus will be one of the most striking. His lust for power, his thirst after dictatorship, are well brought out, while Mr. Walpole shows his gifts in another *genre* by his picture of the boy John. Once again Mr. Walpole suggests the influence of a dwelling and of a district—his beloved lakeland.

They Walk in the City (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.), another of Mr. J. B. Priestley's full length novels, may be called an amalgam of *The Good Companions* and *Angel Pavement*. It begins in Haliford, where Mr. Priestley describes the life of a Yorkshire industrial town with sure touch; it ends in London in melodrama which is much less convincing than the realism which precedes it. The whole is spiced with a little propaganda, for Mr. Priestley cannot hide his social sympathies. In one way there seems to be no reason why a book of this kind should ever end; Mr. Priestley introduces new scenes and characters, skilfully portraying a pair of partners and their business, or a new big store, a process which could go on unto the end of time. It is all very readable, while leaving the impression that somehow it is not Mr. Priestley at his best.

Mr. Richard Sale's *Not Too Narrow . . . Not Too Deep* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) is a "Book Guild" choice. Its publishers ask readers to persevere and not be put off by the horrors of the first sixty pages. They are harrowing indeed. Ten convicts escape from St. Pierre through the jungle; their adventures there and on a tiny sloop at sea are described, and especially the influence of a mysterious eleventh person who joins them. It is *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* over again, but in much more horrible surroundings.

Mrs. Norah Lofts ventured on a difficult enterprise in *Here Was A Man* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), "A Romantic History of Sir Walter Raleigh, his voyages, his discoveries and his Queen", but her courage has been abundantly rewarded. While never deviating much from history, she imparts life and colour to the narrative, which holds the reader from the boyish escapades of the first chapter to the last scene in the Tower.

Mr. Claude Houghton's novels are certainly different, and as a student of abnormal personality he is perhaps in the first rank: of this *Christina* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.) will furnish ample evidence. We can scarcely believe that a man of Brand's gifts would not have recognized at once that the letters he found in his wife's desk after her death were addressed to him. Once we grant Mr. Houghton's premises, however, we have nothing but admiration for the way in which his narrative develops. Seized with jealousy Brand determines to discover the lover to whom the letters were addressed. Suspicion and drink combined gradually drive him over the edge into insanity, and the end is tragedy.

Life of a Lady (Putnam, 5s.) is a play by Messrs. Richard Aldington and Derek Patmore. The central figure is a lady of fashion, whose chance of salvation from a life of glittering selfishness is lost when the one she might have come to love is killed in the War. Her gradual but certain decline is well depicted.

EDITOR.

Mr. S. L. Caiger's *Lives of the Prophets* (S.P.C.K., 5s.) is a popular account of religion in Israel from the time of Amos to that of the Maccabees. On the thread of continuous narrative the beads of prophetic "biography" are strung, and naturally a good deal of imagination goes to their composition, just as with any attempted "life" of Jesus, where there is a similar lack of knowledge. The book is written from a thoroughly modern standpoint (though with some errors of detail), and in a lively and genial manner, and should interest the general reader. Some of the most important sayings are usefully quoted in full, and the author, taught by his experience as a Training College teacher, does not shrink from giving elementary information. Chronological charts help to make the order of events clear.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Dr. A. C. Welch's **Prophet and Priest in Old Israel* (S.C.M., 4s. 6d.) is a study of the place of the cult in Israel's life before the Return, and of the relation of the prophets to that cult. Dr. Welch criticizes the view which maintains that the Hebrew cult was not a native product but more or less a continuation of the ritual and festivals of the Canaanites. He also criticizes the view that the prophets condemned the sacrificial system *per se*. Against those views he holds that the difference between priest and prophet was one of tempo rather than of principle. He shows that priest and prophet combined to supply ethical and spiritual content to the national cult.

Dr. J. Garrow Duncan's *New Light on Hebrew Origins* (S.P.C.K., 5s.) summarizes recent discussions concerning Babylonian, Egyptian, and Canaanite influences on the life and thought of the *O.T.* Dr. Duncan champions the traditional view of the *O.T.*, and is possibly too eager to prove that the *O.T.* is a reliable, historical document. The book is well arranged and forms a good introduction to the writings of Garstang, Flinders Petrie, Woolley, and others. But it is too fragmentary to be really satisfactory. Some words are misplaced on page 203.

J. WOOD.

We have read with much appreciation *Key Words, Studies of the Christian Experience in the Epistle to the Romans,* by Joseph Rutherford (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). A Preface by the Rev. E. B. Storr and an Introduction by Professor A. Victor Murray provide an attractive picture of its author, a self-educated man, who, born of humble parents in Durham, entered the Primitive Methodist ministry in middle life, and so won the esteem of his brethren that, in spite of his lack of training, he was at one time proposed as a candidate for the Principalship of Hartley Theological College. These sermons, we are told, were addressed to simple people. Plain and unembellished as is their style, they are rich in spiritual experience, the utterances of one who had entered so deeply into St. Paul's meaning that he could interpret it in modern speech. He was no phrase-maker, and yet these sermons contain some memorable phrases. How suggestive, for instance, are his words "the paradox of wealth creating debt." These sermons are yet another illustration of the relevancy of Paul's message to modern needs if only it be so well understood that it can be expressed in the language not of Paul's age but ours.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Dr. Greta Hort's *Sense and Thought* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is a study in mysticism based on the fourteenth century English mystical work, *The Cloud of Unknowing.* In effect Dr. Hort sets out to expound the type of mysticism this work contains, comparing it with the better known work of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, and other more orthodox mystical types. *The Cloud of Unknowing* is obscure and difficult to follow. The most valuable part of Dr. Hort's book to the student of mysticism will be its psychological interpretation of much that is dark to the understanding; showing by the way how nearly a mystic's thought may accord with much that is best in modern philosophy. The book has several very interesting footnotes, and is well annotated throughout.

Prof. Lancelot Forster's *The New Culture in China* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is a very welcome survey of the present situation in China from the point of view of a specialist in education. Mr. Forster is Professor of Education in the University of Hong Kong, and his account of the clash of the old and the new cultures in China is written with great understanding of the ancient traditions and ideals of the country, and with an obvious sympathy with them. Young China has been for some time dreaming of a culture like that of Western science which shall bring wealth and prosperity. Prof. Forster works out in many different ways the contrast between East and West. Especially interesting are the chapters on "America and China", "The Moral Issue in China", "The Mass Education Movement", and the final one on "Dr. Hu Shih". There is also an account of the modern Chinese Universities. This is a book which all who have any interest in missionary work in China will find very helpful. It is not written from a missionary angle, but from beginning to end it deals with problems which are identical with those of the mission-field. Can the old Confucian ideals be revived? If not, can the new culture supply its place? These are the questions Prof. Forster writes about with quite exceptional knowledge, and with an unfailing clearness of thought.

The Rev. Frederick Brown's *Boxer and other China Memories* (Stockwell, 2s. 6d.) relates his own missionary experiences in China. It tells once again the story of the Boxer rising, and of the perils and sufferings of that time. The courage and endurance of those in the mission-field in those terrible days is one of the great things in missionary history, and Mr. Brown tells the story well.

Mr. Robert N. Lyne's Life of Sir Lloyd William Mathews, issued under the title *An Apostle of Empire* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), is a very welcome account of the work of a distinguished Colonial servant whose contribution to the welfare of native peoples in East Africa is in the true succession of the best British administration. Sir Lloyd Mathews was First Minister of Zanzibar. He gave the best part of his life to that part of East Africa at the most difficult period of its history, devoting his great abilities especially to the cause of the freedom of the East Africa slaves. This book gives a vivid account of what East African slavery was before the days of freedom, and also of what it cost to achieve that freedom. In this respect, Zanzibar owes more to Lloyd Mathews than to any other man : without him the path to freedom and good government would seem to have been impossible. Among several tributes to his life and work is one from the Friends' Industrial Mission in Pemba; and one from the Aga Khan who says, "Few ever gave him credit for the immense work he did under various Sultans of Zanzibar—work that made the peaceful economic development of those vast countries possible to-day". Mathews died in 1901 at the age of only 51. He was buried in Zanzibar amid universal mourning. This is an excellent narrative of a brave and devoted life.

Miss Marguerite Williams's *Arthur Itter* (R.T.S., 2s. 6d.) tells simply and well the story of a fine Christian life. Arthur Itter lived for his Church, and for his own town of Peterborough, of which at a very early age he became Mayor. The Rev. M. E. Aubrey, of the Baptist Union, writes an introductory note to this excellent memoir.

Miss Dorothea Brande's *Wake Up and Live* (Barker, 3s. 6d.) claims to provide a "formula for success". The first tenet of success is, "Act as if it were impossible to fail". Of the making of books of this kind there does indeed seem to be no end.

Mr. William Masterton's *Evolved or Redeemed ?* (Daniel, 6s.) is an argument for the *Genesis* doctrine of creationism, and against modern theories of evolution. There is a long chapter on "The Great Pyramid as a Divine Revelation". Those who are given to impossible intellectual loyalties will find many of them in this book.

A. T. S. James.

The purpose of Prof. Anatol F. Semenov's *The Greek Language in its Evolution* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is to provide "a short, but nevertheless complete, sketch of the development of the Greek language from the most ancient to its modern form", since "no work exists offering to students *a complete sketch* of this development *in the narrowest compass*". In Part I the author describes the evolution in phonetics and morphology; after dealing with classical Greek and its various dialects, he discusses the κοινή and the Vulgar Greek of the Middle Ages, and finally gives an account of the modern language and its dialects. Part II comprises an outline of Greek syntax. Though in some places where authorities disagree one would have welcomed a stronger lead from the author, he has given students a very valuable sketch; not the least helpful feature is that the narrow compass of the work enables the reader to get a synoptic view of the essential unity of a language which has existed for nearly 3,000 years.

Howard H. Scullard.

Prof. John Wright Buckham's *Christianity and Personality* (New York : Round Table Press, $2.00) is a very interesting and valuable book. It is almost Grecian in scope. That is to say, it raises all the important problems involved in any discussion of Personality, and it deals with them from the

standpoint of Christian experience and philosophy. "This volume is an endeavour to outline some of the principles and problems of such a Personalism in the light of Christianity". The writer is sympathetic to the point of view taken by Critical Realism, and though he is appreciative of the new avenues opened towards theism by recent developments in scientific theory, he is not carried away, as so many are, by the present trend of science towards Berkeleian subjectivism. The Chapter headings give us an adequate idea of the scope of the book. For example, An Evaluation of Personality, The Nature of Personal Knowledge, Personality in Christianity, The Ideal Person, The Perfect Person (here the ontological argument receives fresh and suggestive treatment), God as Experience, and God as Idea.

The author is Professor of Christian Theology in the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, and he makes adequate use of current philosophical and theological writings to illustrate and reinforce his theme. It is a germinative book, most interestingly written, and I have great pleasure in recommending it to all who wish to keep abreast of the best thought of our times on this most important subject.

It is an excellent mental and moral discipline every now and then to subject our fundamental moral natures to a searching scrutiny. That is what Miss Helen Wodehouse does in her delightful book, *Selves and Their Good* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.). There is much confusion as to moral concepts and moral motives. Psychology has complicated the issue for many people with its ideas of "self-expression", "self-assertion", and the like. Should we conceive the "good" as "self-realization' or "self-transcendence"? What part ought the self to have in its good? Is the "good" objective, other than the self? What is the relation of personal to common good, the good of the community? All these questions are splendidly dealt with in this short but most interesting essay of some sixty-eight pages. I can most heartily recommend it to all who are seeking for clear guidance in the moral implications of our faith, and to all students of ethics. It will give them a pleasant and profitable hour and provide them with much food for thought.

JOHN SHORT.

Robert Grossetête, by the Very Rev. B. C. Boulter (S.P.C.K., 5s.) is not intended to be original, but Grossetête's life and ideals are clearly and pleasantly described. His plebeian origin, his interest in Greek, his connexion with the English Franciscans, above all his ruthless idealism, mark Grossetête out from among his contemporaries; and, if his idealism made him hard with people, he was the first to admit it. Features of the book are its illustrations by the author and its historical comparisons, which should attract the beginner, though "one is reminded of Colet" too often. Bishop Boulter writes sympathetically from the Anglo-Catholic angle; the other side appears in Milman's comments on Becket: "there is no remonstrance whatever against disobedience to the laws of God, only to those of the Church" and "the liberty of the Church was a sacrifice to the deified self".

Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury, by Mr. Charles Williams (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), is the name of the play produced in Canterbury Cathedral in June. It is a play of types, only four of the characters being historical individuals; and, though it centres on Cranmer's life and personality, it is essentially an interpretation of his era, with *"Figura rerum:* a skeleton" as his constant companion. The duality of Cranmer's character is made clear: we see the statesman, eventually caught in the toils of his own Erastianism; but we see also the student, devoted to that new realization

of the Word of God in common English, which he regards (in contrast to the Mass) as the miracle of the hour.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

"Of the making of books on Choir-Training", as *Ecclesiastes* might have observed, "there is no end"; and with most of them the painstaking choirmaster rightly feels that when he has read one or two, he has read them all. In *Psychology and the Choir-Trainer* (Dent, 5s.), however, Mr. C. H. Phillips approaches the subject on rather different lines: he is concerned not so much with details of voice-production as with the mentality of choir-members, and how they can best be made to respond to the wishes of the conductor. There are many useful suggestions, always backed up by good psychological reasons and sound common sense, on the conduct of choir-practices, the way to teach new material and keep the interest of the choir alive and keen, and other kindred matters. Dr. Grace said in *The Complete Organist* (the best book of its kind ever written), "While a successful choir trainer *may* have musicianship, he *must* have common sense". Mr. Phillips's valuable and readable book shows how this latter quality can be acquired, and on what sure psychological grounds it is founded.

ERIC H. THIMAN.

Dr. Orville A. Petty's *Common Sense and God* (Author, Yale University, $2) is a discriminating study of naturalistic humanism, especially as represented in the writings of Professor John Dewey. It points out clearly the failure of that philosophy to account for the value-data of common sense.

Dr. Daniel Johnson Fleming's *Ethical Issues Confronting World Christians* (New York: International Missionary Council, $2) is a book destined to become a classic in its own limited field. Sympathetic with missionary endeavour, having himself laboured in India, but keenly alive to the challenge which is being flung to missionary leaders alike by the churches and secular organizations, the author describes the various relationships which missions sustain to other institutions of the world, economic, national, racial, and cultural, and elucidates the ethical issues involved. Has the Christian missionary a right to attempt to break down Buddhist and Mohammedan loyalties? What should the relation of a missionary be to the government of the country to which he is sent? These may suffice to illustrate the type of question which Dr. Fleming asks, and answers.

DOUGLAS HORTON.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS.

Vol. V (May) and Vol. X (October) of the Rev. Alban Butler's *The Lives of the Saints* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d. each) are in the new edition, revised and supplemented by the Rev. H. Thurston, Miss Norah Leeson, and Mr. Donald Attwater. Father Vincent McNabb's *The Science of Prayer* (St. Dominic's Press, 5s.) is a revised edition of a book published in 1903 with the title *Oxford Conferences on Prayer*.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

Prof. C. H. Dodd's Inaugural Lecture **The Present Task in New Testament Studies* (Cambridge Press, 2s.) is an admirable survey which all students of Biblical scholarship should read. Mr. Lancelot Hogben's *The Retreat from Reason* (Watts, 1s.) is the Conway Memorial Lecture for 1936. The Headmaster of Kingsmoor School, Glossop, gave the first address to the Fellowship of Creative Service recently founded at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester. It is published under the title *Youth and the*

New Age (Lindsey Press, 6d.). No one has a better right to speak of Africa than the Rev. A. G. Fraser, who gives the Burge Memorial Lecture on *Africa and Peace* (Oxford Press, 2s.). The Alliance of Honour has just published the following timely booklets: *The Problem of Sex Control,* by Dr. William Brown, *The Meaning of Sex,* by Mary Macaulay (3d. each), and *The Mysteries, Beauties, and Perplexities of Sex* and *Why are Sex Relations Without Marriage Definitely Wrong?* by Dr. A. Herbert Gray (2d. each).

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). A varied number, containing Dr. A. E. Garvie's "The Influence of the Reformation on Christian Ethics", the Rev. F. B. Harvey's "Erasmus", Dr. C. J. Wright's "The Principles of Freedom and Authority", and Mr. D. R. Lock's "John Davidson and the Poetry of the 'Nineties". Dr. A. W. Harrison writes on "The Movement towards Church Reunion in England", and there are many useful contributions under "Notes and Discussions".

The Hibbert Journal (July). A good number, with the Editor's article, to which reference is made in the Editorial, the most important. Mr. Stephen Hobhouse replies to Prof. Broad in "Ought We to Fight for our Country in the Next War?". There are some gleanings from Dr. Inge's notebook, a pleasing article on Erasmus by Dr. W. G. Moore, two on democracy—by Mr. J. A. Hobson and Prof. J. L. Stocks, and Sir E. J. Russell's recent "Hibbert Lecture". Dr. Moffatt surveys theological literature, and Dr. F. C. S. Schiller asks "Has Philosophy Any Message for the World?". The discussions between Miss Sylvia Pankhurst and the Roman Catholic representatives, and on the Liberal-Modernist view of Jesus, are continued.

The Baptist Quarterly (July). Miss C. D. Wood writes about her father's presidential year, and the Rev. S. Pearce Carey on " 'Regent's' as I knew it". The longest article is the Rev. H. J. Flowers's "Protestantism and Liberty". Many pages are devoted to the Baptist Historical Society.

The Baptist Layman (July). The number has three main interests—the Baptist Layman's Conference at Swanwick, of which five impressions are printed; the missionary enterprise is again to the fore; and the new Forward Movement of the Baptist Union comes into prominence. There are some live wires behind this journal.

The Modern Churchman (June-July). In both numbers Dr. Stanley Cook discusses "Biblical Criticism and the Interpretation of History". The Editor prints revised services for the baptism of adults, thanksgiving after childbirth, and visitation of the sick. The Dean of St. Paul's has two sermons, "What is Man?" and "Who is God?", and Dean Inge a lively review of the Church in the twentieth century.

The Church Quarterly Review (July). Lord Hugh Cecil examines the Report on Church and State, the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock writes on "The Last Days of St. Paul", and Mr. Francis Darwin has an article on "The Organization of the Holy Office". Other articles deal with "The Parish Church and the Fifth Form", "Moscow the Third Rome", and "Church and State in Scotland under George I".

The Christian Quarterly (July). The articles are the Editor's "The Word of God and the Apostolicity of the Church", the Rev. T. J. Webley's "Wordsworth, the Poet of Freedom and Duty", and the Rev. James Gray's "Freedom and Tradition in the Church".

The Common Room (Summer). This lively little magazine, published by the Educational Settlements Association, should be seen by all engaged in the work of Social Service.

Social Service Review (May-July). This organ of the National Council of Social Service is of special value in these days of unemployment. It contains facts about new legislation and administration of laws and regulations.

Religion in Education (July). Several articles deal with the teaching of the Old Testament. The Bishop of Truro's handy list of books on the life of Christ, and the discussion of the use of practical activities in teaching Scripture, are both important to day and Sunday School teachers.

The Expository Times (July-September). "Outstanding Old Testament Problems" are dealt with by Canon Battersby Harford and Dr. J. W. Jack. The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Commandments are expounded by Dr. James Reid, Canon Peter Green, and Canon Stuart Morris. Other contributions that deserve attention are Dr. Nicol MacNicol's "The New Mass Movement in India", and Dr. G. F. Barbour's "Faith and Order: The Conference in 1937".

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (July-August). A very learned and useful issue, much of it dealing with the Library's valuable and increasing manuscripts. Mr. C. H. Roberts writes on "Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library", Dr. E. Robertson on some of the Semitic Manuscripts. The Editor has articles on Erasmus and Tindale, and Mr. J. L. Clifford further letters of the Johnson Circle. Dr. Fish has more about Sumerian civilization, Dr. B. Fairley discusses "Goethe's Attitude to Science", and Dr. E. F. Jacob Occam as a political thinker.

The International Review of Missions (July). An interesting number which opens with Dr. K. S. Latourette's "The Problem of Realizing the Church Universal". Mr. S. A. Morrison discusses the work of the indigenous churches and Muslim evangelism. The Rev. Frank Ryrie writes on "Evangelism and Village Crafts", Dr. L. Hodous on "The Ministry of Chinese Religions", and Dr. C. S. Miao on "Education for Lay Service in the Christian Church in China". Other articles are the Rev. K. Alden's "The Prophet Movement in Congo", Father Bonsirven's "The Missionary Work of the Roman Catholic Church among the Jews", Mr. Kenneth Grubb's "Co-operation and Fellowship", and Mr. J. Merle Davis's "The Cinema and Missions in Africa".

World Dominion (July). Mr. George Hart's "Through Siberia and Russia" gives the unfortunate impression of being biased, and that will perhaps discount its effect. "New Testament Principles and Modern Missions", by a Missionary Secretary, is timely. Dr. W. W. Cadbury's "A Great Adventure" tells of a hundred years of medical missions. "The New Day in India" describes the mass movements. The Rev. Maurice Leenhardt continues his study of the relation of missions to governments.

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). Dr. R. E. D. Clark discusses "Miracles: A Necessary Adjunct of Revelation", and the Rev. F. A. Aston "The Jewish Background of Early Christianity". Other articles worth reading are Dr. Maclean's "Predestination in History", Dr. Allis's "Modern Dispensationalism and the Law of God", and Dr. Wencelius's "L'Idée de Modération dans la Pensée de Calvin".

Religion in Life (Summer). American Methodists ought to be congratulated on this very readable journal. Perhaps its success is due to the fact that they draw largely on Congregationalism for their contributors! Dr. Van Dusen examines "A Half-Century of Liberal Theology", and Dr. Foakes Jackson "Modern Theological Education". Other articles well worth reading are Dr. R. H. Stafford's "The Organic Principle of the Church", Dr. Earl Marlatt's "Blessed Are the Debonair", and Prof. Carl S. Patton's "In a Time Like This". The Rev. R. Birch Hoyle has a useful survey of theological publications during the last few months.

The Review and Expositor (July). There is a long study of the life of Roger Williams, and a long expository section. Several articles deal with ministerial duties and pastoral work. Mr. H. P. Colson's "The Technique of Pastoral Counselling" does not seem as useful as some of the other articles in the "Facing Pastoral Problems" Series.

The Yale Review (Summer). It is good to see ourselves as others see us, and an article on "Englishmen and Others" by a young Italian, Signor Curzio Malaparte, is useful to that end. Prof. R. M. Hutchins writes on "University Education", Prof. J. H. Bradley on "In the Beginning". In "Facing the Deficit" Prof. R. M. Haig looks to future American Budgets, and in "The Yankee Trader in 1936", Prof. P. W. Bidwell shows how in international trade the Americans have made good bargains. There are two stories by Miss Lura Beam and Mr. E. P. O'Donnell. The Letters of Edward Arlington Robinson are very well worth reading.

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (May). The Editor asks "How Dependable is History?" The rest of the journal is occupied with domestic matters, though there is a review section of "books of interest to ministers".

Harvard Theological Review (July). Prof. J. B. Pratt discusses "God and the Moral Law" and Dr. J. S. Bixler "Josiah Royce—Twenty Years After". Mr. G. R. Driver writes on "Textual and Linguistic Problems of the Book of Psalms".

Anglican Theological Review (July). The main articles are the Rev. W. H. P. Hatch's "Jesus' Summary of the Law and the Achievement of the Ideal according to St. Paul" and Mr. C. G. Richardson's "Cardinal Julian of the House of Cesarini". Other subjects are "Is Death Frustration?" and "An Aristotelian Theory of Prayer". In "Notes and Comments" we are reminded of the heavy losses sustained by Christian scholarship in recent months—W. F. Badé, E. S. Drown, R. Seeberg, W. Douglas Mackenzie, Eduard König, Hans Windisch, and many others.

THE TENTH THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE OF CONGREGATIONALISTS.

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE. JULY 6th—9th, 1936.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF COMMUNITY.

Monday, July 6th. Evening. *The Christian Conception of Community.* Prof. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.

Tuesday, July 7th. Morning. *The Conception of Community in the History of the Church.* Prof. C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D.
Evening. *The Psychological Foundations of Community.* Rev. F. E. England, M.A., Ph.D.

Wednesday, July 8th. Morning. *Community and Political Theory.* Prof. H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D.
Evening. *The Present Challenge.* Dr. J. H. Oldham.

Thursday, July 9th. Morning. *The Way Forward.* Rev. B. C. Plowright, B.A., B.D.

AN IMPRESSION.

By Albert Peel.

No subject more timely could have been chosen. The Committee had arranged an admirable programme, the speakers all having peculiar qualifications for dealing with the subjects allotted to them.

The Conference, about the average in numbers, met under the Chairmanship of the Rev. N. Goodall, M.A., whose conduct of the sessions combined skill and grace. Mr. A. B. Russell, the Treasurer of the Conference since its inception, was absent owing to illness, and affectionate greetings were sent to him. The Rev. B. C. Plowright had organized the Conference with his customary efficiency, and those present appreciated Cambridge and the opportunities for social fellowship as well as the Conference itself. Many of them were the faithful supporters of the Conference from the beginning—some of them were attending their tenth Conference. Seven ladies added a little colour, though it must be said that some of the men did their best in this regard: not only was the Rev. Malcolm Spencer present, but before the end of the proceedings Dr. John Shortowski was presented with a tie of Communist hue which, it may be presumed, will not be seen in the Lyndhurst Road pulpit. This number of ladies, although perfect, was by no means a sufficient representation of the sex which has a majority of voters and a big majority of church members. Nor was the number of laymen adequate to balance the ministerial element. Some of the laymen have been very loyal to the Conference and have con-

tributed largely to its success from the beginning. But we should have more of them, and it was to the advantage of the Conference that new laymen were present, including that fine veteran Dr. Mark Jackson, of Bexhill, and Dr. Will G. Moore, of St. John's College, Oxford. Some ministers, too, attended for the first time, including, I was glad to note, some newly settled men. Ministers would find in this Conference a refresher course which would be of great service to them, and I am confident I am speaking for the Conference Committee in urging ministers, especially young men whose College course is not far behind them, to make a practice of attending.

The speakers served the Conference well, and not merely in the papers printed within, but perhaps even more in the discussions which followed. Active among the participants were Dr. John Short, the Rev. E. W. Johnson, the Rev. H. Cunliffe Jones, the Rev. Malcolm Spencer, and the Rev. T. W. Roff (in addition to the speakers, several of whom were present all through the Conference—would that all had been !) among the ministers, and Mr. H. E. A. Condon and Dr. Moore among the laymen.

The informal after-dinner talks, while they included some lively cross-examinations of speakers, suffered from being too desultory and discursive: the freedom of the members should have been disciplined, and a dictator in the Chair at these sessions would have been of service. On the first evening, when we were supposed to be discussing a paper on the New Testament, we ranged over all the week's discussions, and anticipated much in subsequent papers. Nor did we get the best always out of the speakers when we had them: Dr. England was kept on economics for a long time when more might have been got out of him by drawing him on the psychological questions on which he has specialized. We did, however, have a good many eloquent perorations from recent sermons !

A feature of debates was the marked enthusiasm of some of the ministers for the social revolution, and the general scepticism of the laymen as to the practicability of some of their proposals. Whether the Conference gave much help to business men who are trying to obey the Christian ethic in a competitive system may be doubted: some of the ministers seemed to fail to see how much they themselves were involved in the system they denounced.

The Conference got "well together", and there is no doubt that its members received much stimulus during the week. A legitimate criticism, perhaps, is that the Conference reflected the modern pre-occupation with economics, and heard too little about the redemptive power of Christ for society as well as for the individual.

This Impression would not be complete without reference to the central part played by the devotional services. Dr. Short conducted a service each morning at 10 o'clock, and Mr. Goodall a Communion Service on Tuesday evening, while early morning prayers were taken by the Revs. W. B. J. Martin, T. W. Roff, and H. F. Leatherland.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF COMMUNITY.

By Prof. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.

In any discussion of the Christian conception of Community, as indeed of any aspect of Christianity, it is well to begin by recalling the essential element in Christianity. Christianity is not simply a *Weltanschauung*; it is a message, and a way of life. It springs from the conviction, the cer-

tainty, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; that Christ, the Son of God, was sent into the world by His Father in order that through Him, at whatever cost, men might become, like Him, the sons of God, sharing with Him all that He could impart to them of what was involved in His relation to God. This is clear and dominant in the Fourth Gospel; it is indeed the one thing that its author is asserting from beginning to end; and all else must be understood in the light of this—the Logos doctrine, the Incarnation, and the Death of Christ. God is more than creator or judge or king; He is the Father of Jesus; and Jesus is one with God, and therefore, as we say, divine, because He is the Son; and salvation is bound up with our reception into this same relation of sonship, with corresponding relations to one another. We are redeemed into a society of sons; and even as Jesus shares all things with the Father—His glory, His works, His knowledge and His life itself—so we are to share all this through Jesus; what He has received from the Father He gives to us; and as He abides in us, so we are bound to one another in love—that passionate resolve to treat one another as He has treated us.

Central in the Johannine writings, this conception of sharing, of community, cannot be said to occupy quite the same place in the rest of the *New Testament*; but nothing that Paul writes either in the doctrinal, as they are called, or the practical sections of his letters can be understood without it; what is his "abiding in Christ" but the witness to our sonship in Him through the Spirit? The Synoptists make far more of the unique sonship of Jesus as the means by which the Father's purpose is fulfilled for us than is often realized; and the outstanding passage in *Matt.* 11 and its parallels, especially when viewed in relation to its context, while it has sometimes been called a "Johannine boulder", is not only central to the Synoptic tradition, but the keystone of the arch.

All this seems far enough from the sense in which we generally use the word "community"; from the book, for example, for which Maciver chose the word "Community" as its title. But it is one of the contentions of this paper that the word, as the sociologist may use it, can only be understood when we sit at the feet of the theologian; that here we must learn the meaning of the human from the divine; and that the true form of community, as Plato might say, like that of fatherhood and sonship, is laid up in heaven. The sociologist, indeed, is well aware that all human life is lived in groups; even the Homeric Cyclops was not an isolated individual. And every group is the scene of reciprocal rights or claims and duties. But each member of a group has his own specific rights and duties. The simplest group is the family; father, mother, and child; the rights and duties of the husband are not the same as those of the wife; those of the parent differ from those of the child; and the family is built up on a recognition of this elementary fact. It is a unity; but a unity, as unity must always be, in diversity. So with the other social groups, which extend or limit the action of the family and of each other. When we think of the tribal group, we think of the chief, the elders, the priests, the witch-doctors, the war leaders, the initiates, the uninitiated, and the rest, each having his separate place and functions, and each fulfilling them in his own way. The same thing is clear, but on a far more extended scale, if we look at the Greek city state, or at the Holy Roman Empire of medieval times, or at our own vastly developed society. Few will fail to recognize, what was clear enough to the Greek political philosopher, and equally clear, in another fashion, to Dante as to his teachers, that it is in the community, that is, in this system of inter-related groups, each individual being a member of several, and having his appointed place in each, that true and worthy life is alone possible. The individual, cut off from a community (if we

could imagine such a being), is not a truncated man; he is not a man at all; and the more diverse is the life of the groups, spreading out into the spheres of religion, art, manufacture, trade, recreation, and the like, so the more completely does the individual "find" himself, and become what he was meant to be.

But there is another aspect of the community as a system of groups. First of all, human nature being what it is, individuals are often (though not, it must be remembered, always) more interested in their rights than their duties; they must be kept in order, or they will, as they do, throw the machinery out of gear. Moreover, the groups themselves clash, the rights and duties assigned to the individual as a member of one may and do collide with those assigned to him as a member of others. Groups may attack each other, or they may combine with one another to attack other combinations. Hence the internal struggles of parties and interests; and the external conflicts of war. Out of all this welter arises the State, and the force on which the State is founded. For when once the simplest stage of social life is passed, force is inevitable, to keep some sort of order between both individuals and groups. Then comes the chance of the aspiring and dominant character, who surrounds himself with a bodyguard or an army; and when armies face one another across the frontiers of States, aggression becomes equally inevitable, even though it is concealed under the milder name of self-defence; and we have the germ of the situation with which we are shudderingly familiar to-day.

There is thus a tension, a contradiction, in all human life; as the old philosopher put it, hate and love dwell together; the very impulse that drives men to combine, to serve one another's interests, to construct organized and harmonious systems of groups, drives them also against one another; tearing down in one moment of fury what they have built up by slow years of co-operation. "I" and "mine" pass into "we" and "ours"; but "ours" implies "not yours"; and instead of a confused *bellum omnium contra omnes,* we have struggles between embattled hosts whose very combativeness is founded on a noble sense of common loyalty and self-devotion to a common cause. One might almost be forgiven for thinking that humanity had turned its best into its worst; or is the clash and the conflict only an accident? Is hate to be regarded as a kind of tragically prolonged growing-pain of love, which will at last be left behind as community becomes mature and perfect?

With this question in mind, let us turn once more to our Christian conception, and see what we can make of it, or whether we can find a place for it in so rude and unkind a world as ours. But to do this, we must go behind the *New Testament* to the *Old.* The Hebrews are often regarded as a peculiar people ruled over by a particularly ferocious and capricious tribal god. This is hardly worth calling even a caricature. The Hebrews were indeed unique; but this was because, while many other nations have made some identification of their gods and their kings, the Hebrews alone took this identification *au grand sérieux.* But their Jehovah was no tyrant, no oriental Sultan. Their relation to Him was not that of a subject or worshipping nation, but of a people. The distinction, slight or almost unintelligible to us, was vital to them. There was all the difference in the world between a *'am* and a *goy,* a *laos* and an *ethnos.* The difference was, according to the Hebrews, that while the other nations thought of their gods as protectors or despots or even progenitors, Jehovah was bound to His people by the terms of a covenant; a compact by which they were bound to perform certain services to Him, and by which also He was bound to perform certain services to them; it was a mutual affair, just like the relation of parent and child in a family. But how if the people did not

perform its part? If they refused the services? Then (and this is a point still more noteworthy), instead of merely punishing the rebels, or leaving them to themselves, He set Himself to bring them back to the right frame of mind, as originally He had brought them into the covenant, where they would both give and receive as He had proposed. Covenant meant, in actual fact, not merely reciprocity (reciprocity between earth and heaven) but redemption. Hence, the two great words of the *Old Testament,* which we can only understand when we bear in mind the covenant: justice, as we call it, and mercy. Justice or righteousness we generally think of as the stern virtue which will give a man as much as he is entitled to, but no more; and will give it him all the more inflexibly if what he is entitled to is punishment. But there is nothing of this Kantian austerity in the Hebrew word. Righteousness is not a matter so much of conduct or morality as of personal relations. God is righteous because in regard to man He is always in the right, in the right attitude; He never ill-treats man or neglects him or tries to over-reach or defraud or oppress him. He is always bound by the terms of the covenant; and when man breaks the terms, *i.e.,* gets into the wrong, becomes unrighteous, Jehovah is so utterly in the right that He can never rest till He has set man in the right too. That is why Job holds so desperately to his righteousness, because he has been mastered by the dreadful fear that God is after all in the wrong and that it is he who is in the right; and that is why Jehovah, in all the splendid prophetic passages in *Second Isaiah,* is revealing His righteousness; He is showing Israel that He has always been in the right with them; He has always kept His covenant with them; never more so than when He is bringing them back to keep their covenant with Him. Mercy, too, is more than our word, beautiful as it is; it is the passionate loyalty to the personal bond, and to the persons who should keep it, whether they do so or not; shining most clearly, doubtless, when the bond has been broken; but meant to be conspicuous always, as when the faithful wife is said to show "mercy" to her husband. Clearly, both these words belong not to the law court nor to the ethics class-room: you must look for them in a family, where the father waits for a disobedient son to return to his place in the home, or goes to fetch him.

Two things must further be observed; first, that this covenant relation of God to His people means also that His subjects hold themselves to be in a covenant relation to each other. Their duties to Him, as ordained by the covenant, are their duties to each other. The insolence of office, the law's delay, the proud man's contumely, and the scorns that patient merit of the unworthy takes (how familiar were all of these to Amos and Isaiah) were offences to Him; a Hebrew could not love Jehovah without loving His brothers. And while a man might make up for some ritual misdemeanour to Jehovah by sacrifice at the altar, he could only atone for wrong-doing to his brother by repentance and amending his ways. Secondly, this relation is primarily one which concerns the Hebrews alone. It is with the sons of Abraham that the covenant is made; and while there were rare moments when other nations were thought or dreamt of as sharing this blessing, yet the people felt itself to be marked off for ever from the nations; and its very loyalty to its God flung it into resolute and even desperate hostility to them.

We are now ready to turn from the *Old Testament* to the *New.* Only when the *Old Testament* is carefully studied can we see how the teaching of Jesus was rooted in it. The personal and the redemptive elements in the idea of the covenant were vital to Him; but He enlarged them by three additions; God He spoke of openly, not as a king but as a father; indeed, the word king as applied to God He seems ostentatiously to avoid; the

national limitations of the covenant are to be transcended, if not in His own lifetime, immediately afterwards; and redemption is to come about, not by some great historical event like the deliverance from Egypt or Babylon or Syria, but through His own death.

Let us look at all this a little more closely. God, we have just seen, was not spoken of as king: yet the phrase "The Kingdom of heaven" was continually on the lips of Jesus; and it is often taken to be the expression (whatever it actually meant) for Jesus's conception of the true or the ideal community. That may be; but it needs, as we are all aware here, very careful examination. Many have understood it as if it meant little more than the good time coming, or the kind of society our own predilections would lead us to desire; when the League of Nations will be supreme and unchallenged; when there will be universal disarmament; when we shall have achieved an eight hour day for all—or shall it be a six hour day, or even less?; when there will be no more exploitation or competition, or, it would seem to follow, capitalism; or shall we rather say, no more socialism or communism? Naturally for such a Kingdom as this, however we envisage it (we are almost forgetting to ask how Jesus may Himself have envisaged it), we shall wish to work; to organize campaigns against alcohol or gambling or commercialized vice or poverty, we say, is to work for the Kingdom. Now there can be no doubt that eagerness for social improvement has accomplished the most noteworthy results; and it has gained enormously from the loyalty of Christian men to their Master. But the Kingdom of God means a great deal more than this. It is neither a territory nor a society, as we might talk of the Kingdom of Great Britain or of Italy, nor is it a code of rules or laws or conduct. The Kingdom of God should rather be the Kingship, the divine rule or sovereignty, of God. It is God's rule over man, and the duty of man is not to work for it—for it is there; but to acknowledge it and act as if it were, what it is in the mind of God, real. It must be obeyed instead of the rule of any false gods, like Mammon, or hate, or cupidity, or fear.

Now we can see the significance of the avoidance by Jesus of the term "King" for God. This sovereign rule is exercised by a father; "your father which is in heaven". But every sovereign must have some subjects to rule over; and the subjects must be gathered, by the very fact of being ruled by the same authority, into some sort of a society. Now the society over which a father rules is a family. Hence the Kingdom of heaven must mean that the divine sovereignty is fulfilled in a society which knows itself to be a family, and in which the subjects live together as members of a family.

The rule of God is paternal; that is, it is strong, comprehensive, patient, and tender; it demands all, and it gives all. But to understand God is to understand man; men, as being ruled by a father, are not merely subjects, but sons and brothers. Their conduct to one another is defined by what is expected in their conduct to Him. The chosen and necessary sphere of God's rule is a family. Indeed, all that is said about conduct by Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, so unpractical as it has often been thought, and generally despaired of, or quietly regarded as impossible and not really to be troubled about at all, becomes natural when we place ourselves in the atmosphere of a family. What more natural, when you are dealing with your own brother, than that you should lend to him without asking to be repaid by a certain date, or that you should make him a present when he asks you; or even that you should think a great deal more about examining yourself than about criticizing him, and that you should even turn to him the other cheek? Once think of the Beatitudes themselves as the description

of what constitutes real happiness in a family, and you pass out of the region of paradox.

But we must beware, when we speak of the family, of thinking of it as a completed or even united family. Jesus did not come simply to reveal God as Father; He came to bring man back into His family. His purpose was redemptive. If we think of Him as the true and typical son, we see in Him one who is dealing with men who are not yet sons, or do not know themselves as such. He has to bring them back. He has to treat them as His brothers, while as yet they refuse to respond. And that is what His followers have to do. Their sonship too is redemptive. If it were not so, sonship would be easy. "If ye love them that love you, what thank have ye?" The community which He has in mind is redemptive, missionary; it is to grow; its laws are meant to be obeyed by all mankind; does not God purpose to be the universal father? But even if those who obey His law are only a little flock, they must go into all the world; they must be prepared for persecution; they must put all things second to their redeeming mission; they must preach the good news to every creature.

When this is understood, it becomes natural that Jesus does not speak about working for the Kingdom. It does not come with observation, or labour. It is to be sought, and preached, rather than founded or built up. It is here, even if it is to come; it is near, even if none can tell the hour of its appearance. If it meant some outward form of society, this would be contradictory; but if the Kingdom denotes an attitude, a recognition, a personal devotion to God's fatherly rule, all is clear. It is like the seed or the leaven; it is a pearl or a hidden treasure. It is given; it appears; it is entered; it is even seized. And if it contains the good and the bad, like the drag-net, and if the attitude of the servants of the Kingdom is like that of subjects waiting for the return of their lord, what could better describe a community in which men's recognition is often so equivocal, yet where any moment may see sonship suddenly made real? I do not propose to ask you to discuss at length the question of Apocalyptic: did Jesus expect the Kingdom soon or late? Those who labour this question seem to me to misunderstand the Kingdom as an attitude of mind in man, dependent on God's fatherly rule, manifest even while it waits for its full manifestation. It is not a question of chronology at all. If Jesus had looked forward to some given date, His words would be those not of expectation but of careless inconsistency. Wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, there is the son of the Heavenly Father in their midst; and how could they go on following Him if they did not believe that the Kingdom, obviously not yet here, was on its way? They did not, however, live as He bade them because the end was so near that they could throw ordinary prudence to the winds; but because they recognized a new kind of sovereignty which, as soon as they acted on it, was in existence.

One is half tempted to think of a country whose king is "over the water". In such a country, some will be loyal to the absent sovereign; some will temporize, some will disobey and make their peace with the intrusive government. For the first class, their loyalty will bind them into a firm brotherhood; their intercourse with one another is itself a joy and delight; and in their conduct to one another, and, so far as it can be carried out, at whatever risk, to others also, the sovereignty they acknowledge will be actual; their very life is a proclamation of the Kingdom; they have entered into it. Others will enter into it also: and while they wait for its full manifestation, when the king will be once more within his borders, and the invading foes have been rolled back, they can share with one another all that the Kingdom has to give to its subjects.

Such then would seem to be the conception of community as it is worked out in the Gospels; a society where men regard themselves as bound to one another by the closest ties, because of the reality of the fatherhood of God into which they have entered, and whose destiny governs their whole conduct to the world at large. The phrase was soon forgotten; it is hardly met with outside the Synoptic Gospels—a tribute, by the way, to their historical accuracy; but the idea lived on in the early Church. It is difficult for us at this distance to picture the existence of the early community described in *Acts*. When we use the word "church" of it, we think naturally of a religious institution, existing, as churches for the most part exist to-day, for worship, the maintenance of buildings or plant, the conversion or training of souls, and the raising of funds. But the community in *Acts* was much more than this. We are told but little of its experience, its language, or its worship. Perhaps there was not much to tell. But we do know that all the new disciples recognized Jesus Himself as Lord, and, as if they knew that divine lordship meant human brotherhood and family life, they proceeded to act as if they had entered one great family. They translated, it would appear, their new conception into a very vigorous system of sharing with one another. The preaching or the proclamation of the new truth that Jesus had been raised from the dead they seem to have left to the apostles; but they spent as much time as they could with one another; they did the same things at the same times; and there sprang up in their midst a simple but effective method of mutual assistance. This could hardly be called communism; it was certainly not compulsory; but to make more thorough the participation of the "haves", as we might say, with the "have-nots", many of them spontaneously capitalized their resources, and so produced a large common fund for the relief of the needs of the community as a whole.

Naturally, this soon broke down; because what was comparatively workable in a small local community could not be carried on when the community began to spread. But the spirit of it was preserved in that wide charity which is illustrated in the Pauline collection—a new thing in the history of philanthropy—and which in later generations surprised and sometimes amused pagan observers. But it would be wholly unfair to regard the principle of sharing in the new communities as if it was mainly economic. As we study the early history we can see a new way of life unfolding; the conception of a new relation between men and women which influenced every part of their conduct to one another. The Christian family is in being. And it spreads. The community is expansive. Although propaganda was apparently left at first to the apostles, as we saw, yet events kept the members of the new society, so to speak, on the move; and wherever the Christians carried the practice of their new life, others were attracted to it, and joined them. We do not know what was the chief cause of this attraction. If it was eloquent preaching, many great preachers must have remained nameless. More probably it was the life itself; the gladness, the cheerfulness, the friendship, the *élan* of which Luke gives so many hints in *Acts*. Whether in those early days they knew very much about our Lord's actual precepts or not, they had taken to heart the command to go from Judæa into Samaria and then into all the world. Even though the debate in the Council of Jerusalem was yet to come, they were beginning to discover what was meant by the great words "neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free".

But if we do not know what was the chief principle of attraction, we can make a shrewd guess when we turn to the Pauline epistles; these, if read carefully, give a remarkable picture both of what the Church was and of what it was not, but what the better minds felt it ought to be. Even

to-day, the later portions of the Pauline epistles receive inadequate attention. It is easy to regard them as ethical appendixes, coming, like the "applications" of sermons, when attention has completed its main task and is justifiably growing a little weary. But it is safe to say that the original hearers paid a good deal more attention to them than to what had gone before. For one thing, they were very much easier to understand; for another, we can see how many echoes of the type of teaching they contain are found in the sub-apostolic writings, notably Clement and Barnabas. Moreover, this Pauline type of teaching, if we compare it with familiar secular types of ethical systems, is highly original; compared with the sayings of Jesus, it is just what we should have expected from one who had learnt to think of the Christian community as a family: everyone thinking, not of his own interests, but of those of others also; in honour preferring one another; giving with a cheerful gaiety; devoted to entertaining guests; sympathetic alike in laughter and tears; horrified at the idea of quarrelling and abuse, as of loose talk. So one might go on in chapter after chapter of the letters. We miss the virtues of the citizen, or the man about town; whole realms of conduct seem to be ignored; but everything that is enjoined springs quite definitely from one attitude of mind; and when we turn back to the earlier or doctrinal chapters, we can see where that attitude is based; it is because men know that they are sons of God that this attitude of the family becomes possible and natural and delightful. The Christians have been called into a new and marvellous world; they have received a gift which can never be adequately expressed in human speech. They are destined to receive more than heart can imagine. They are the objects of a perfectly unmerited grace from God Himself. And all this they share with each other. That is to say, they have it in common. They have been made sons; and the spirit or breath of sonship blows round and enters into them all, as if it were the common air around them that fills the lungs of each. They find themselves in a community wherein a man must say of everything that is of real value to him, "It is not mine; it is ours". But there is a further parallel to the picture of the Christian community as we have found it in the Gospels—surely an undesigned one; and its familiarity to us must not blind us to its importance. The community is not self-contained or self-satisfied; it insists on going outside itself. The members act to one another as if joined together in a great family; but they act by the same rule towards those who are without. The contrast between the exclusive Israelite State and the expansive Christian community is now for the first time explicit. Whether the non-Israelite is a devout enquirer, a scoffer, or an open persecutor, he is to be approached in the same way, with the same appeal of friendliness and persuasion and brotherly forbearance. To be a heathen man and a publican is now to be the object of the Christian's attack.

What then shall we say of the Church? Shall we identify the Christian community with the Church? Unfortunately, the word Church is highly ambiguous, and it is rarely safe to talk about the Church without explaining very carefully in what sense the word is used. If by the Church we mean the actual Christians who were members of the various local Christian societies scattered about the shores of the Mediterranean in the first century, and joined to one another by their religious experience, their emissaries and messengers, their slowly growing literature, and their rites, we shall not be far astray; although we must bear in mind the startling number of pictures of unfaithfulness and degeneracy in the *New Testament* itself. But when we follow the Church into the succeeding centuries, we see a community of a very different kind; relying rather on its hierarchy than its dependence on Christ; resting on correctness of belief rather than on

generosity in any kind of sharing; and taking refuge in conditions of membership which did not only make it impossible to separate the wheat from the tares, but even to distinguish the one from the other. In the Middle Ages, Church and State were identified, as aspects of the one Christian society; a magnificent dream; but it meant in reality, not that society was raised to the level of the Christian community, but that the latter was lowered to the level of society, or even beneath it. At the Reformation it became finally impossible to speak about the Church; indeed, this had really been impossible since the split between East and West. And although the worst scandals of the Middle Ages were now shamed out of existence, the churches became increasingly organizations for public worship and private instruction, along with the support of the ministry and the ritual; as far as private life and conduct were concerned, they were generally content to enforce a certain code of morals rather than to inspire a personal attitude of devotion and service; any further extensions were looked for as the result of the preaching or the pastoral work of the few rather than of the Christian fidelity of the many.

But do we not see the principle of community at work in the most thorough-going fashion in monasticism? The answer is that monasticism went at once too far and not far enough. It was so complete a common life that its supporters were taken out of the world altogether, and therefore did very little to mould the world they had left; while, since what they shared were mostly external things, property and the occupation of time behind closed doors, the real spirit of Christian community as we have described it found great difficulty in maintaining itself. Other forms of the attempt to live the common life on a Christian basis have been more successful in avoiding the second weakness; but they have for the most part been too sporadic or short-lived to have left any mark behind them.

If anything like a Christian community has been impossible hitherto, in the Church, within monasticism, or in the sects, the prospect to-day seems even more remote. Life is so highly organized both for business and pleasure, its struggles and rivalries are so intense, and its various groups, within and outside the nations, are so regimented alike for attack and defence, co-operation and antagonism, that any other organization would be likely to be at once squeezed out. The modern totalitarian State at all events has shown clearly that it does not intend to tolerate any Church which refuses to be held in by bit and bridle; while in other countries, for example, England and America, organized religion is rather the hobby of a few than a way of life for the multitude. A dismal outlook indeed; but perhaps not desperate. If those who still hope for something from the Christian ideal of community lament that such a community seems unable to get itself organized to-day, let them remember that organization is precisely what was lacking in the picture of the Christian community in the Gospels. That community was so much like a family that, as in a family, all officials were felt to be out of place. "Call no one your master on earth". There was only one father, the father in heaven; while the apostles appear to have been expected to be a sort of elder brother for the rest; and the whole family was held together by the spirit of son-making of which we have spoken, and on which both Paul and John were explicit.

Impossible, one says: no society could exist without more organization than that. Yet when Paul was shaping his churches, his officers appear to have done little more than extend the *rôle* of the apostles; and what he did emphasize was that each member of the whole should not only serve the rest in general, but use his specific gifts. Thus he plays the part of a member of a family; for the family is the group where, as we saw, each has his special part to fill, in the matter of both claims and duties, in the complex

unity of the whole. And indeed it is this which has done the work of Christianity all through the last twenty centuries. The overthrow of the antique paganism of the ancient world, the conquest of the barbarism of the invaders, the gradual winning of European society to the recognition of at least some of the ideals of Christian community; all this would certainly not have been accomplished without the vast organization of the medieval church, nor without the mighty labours of prophets and martyrs and missionaries; but it has been in the main the work of the poor and simple, whose hearts the Lord hath touched, and who have in every age waited for the consolation of Israel, living as if Christ had bidden them to brother all the souls of men. The warfare of Christianity has always been a soldier's battle. It has not been waged with the armour of the armed man or garments rolled in blood; but with the kindliness and faith which has won the lion to lie down with the lamb.

Thus, the Christian idea of community is not that of a group to rival others, and to grow at their expense. The *New Testament* has shown us, rather, a community that might almost be called, in contrast with others, invisible, held together by secret loyalties and experiences, possessions and aims, only to be revealed to the few; able to exist anywhere, ready to pray for kings and rulers, rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; never reviling, never rebuking; hoping, bearing, and believing all things of all men; using every means afforded by life or occupation or situation, if by so doing some might be saved and won. Against all this, there can be no legal enactments!

For this very reason, and by this very means, it is possible to contemplate the capture of society. Hitherto, the Churches have tried to capture society by the use of its own weapons, to impose on it their own laws, or to set their magistrates and officers above or at least by the side of its own. That is not how Christianity, if we may trust Tertullian, won its way in the early centuries. Do not try to escape from your position, however unwelcome or distressing, said Paul; "use it rather". In whatever country, whatever calling, the Christian finds himself, he is equally at home, and equally a stranger; a stranger, because he is mixing with men who know nothing of brotherhood as he understands it; who cannot perceive that he is seeking their good because God has secured his; and at home, because every place is made for his supreme and divine activity of sharing all that he most values, and for realizing the companionship of all others who would live as he lives, either in the body or the spirit. He says neither "dear city of Cecrops", nor "dear city of Zeus"; his national home, if I may use the expression, is in heaven; but he looks for the city whose builder and maker is God, and he knows that he is already come, with all his fellow-travellers, unto Mount Zion.

Let us suppose for a moment that this conception of community were carried out to any considerable extent in the churches as they exist to-day; and that in courts, cabinets, councils, parliaments, board-rooms, trade union committees, and even in the meetings of leaders of the churches themselves, Christian men sat with the express determination to treat everyone they met as their brothers, as men whom they were set to bring into the family of God, and whose interests were as sacred as their own. It is not unsafe to say that such an attitude would soon produce something like a revolution; because although the world is aware of the various conventions that Christians are supposed to observe in their conduct, no one has ever supposed that more than a few exceptional Christians would put their neighbour's well-being by the side of their own, or that a Christian woman would regard it as part of her Christian duty to see that her neighbour had as good a sink as she had herself.

Such a course, indeed, would involve immense difficulties and demand endless courage; especially in these days of highly developed group life, where a man of character will constantly find himself chosen to lead his own group and attack the rest. How is the statesman, for example, to express the spirit of community in this sense, or the trade union leader, or the manager of a business threatened by acute competition? Yet even for such men as these, the stars in their courses are beginning to fight; and the life of groups in the world of struggle and rivalry around us is discovering that war will never bring peace; and that only by treating men as probable friends instead of as certain foes can you induce them to sheathe their sword or allow you to sheathe your own.

But there is more to it than this; for if the Christian conception of community were thus taken seriously, the Church would itself be transformed, and would be enabled to do what it has never done before. For most of the men of whom we have been thinking are members of Churches; that is, the channels of the more intimate Christian fellowship are open to them. What a flood of sympathy, hope, mutual understanding, need, and help would pour through those channels if men began to work out the implications of their common faith and experience. The difficulties that might frighten the individual would disappear before the combined wisdom of a group that met in the spirit of Christ and for the ends of the Kingdom of God. Moreover, they would discover that the Church, as Paul was continually reminding his followers, is not a merely human institution; it is founded on the rock; it is even called, by a bold though highly obscure metaphor, the body of Christ; that is, when men come together as the children of God, redeemed by Christ, and resolved to tread together the new and living way, they become conscious of a power in their midst which is greater than their own combined power or wisdom. He who shares His sonship with them is somehow living in their midst: if they abide in Him, He abides in them. It is not their own work they are doing, or even God's: it is God who is doing His work in them.

And if this conception of community will transform the Churches from the rather feeble and ineffective things that they are at present, it will also transform society itself. We have spoken before of the tension in all human society. Whatever we may believe about the fall, society is not wholly corrupt. No society, no group, could exist, as Plato saw long ago, if there were not in it some justice, some sharing, some love. If the Christian would carry out his advance all along the line, if he would permeate society in every part, he finds allies everywhere. Everywhere he will meet co-operation, and the longing, hidden or expressed, to extend its borders, and to overcome the agony and terror of hate and warfare. And this is true whether we think of those large political and international movements which most of us can only watch from afar, or of those matters of business and social and private affairs where we have to prove our mettle. For great and small are all one to God: and if He can see with equal eye, as Lord of all, a hero perish or a sparrow fall, He rewards the cup of cold water even as He can take up Elijah by a whirlwind into heaven. To be saved, society must be released from its tension. Nothing can release it, humanly speaking, but a community, an impulse to share and to serve, and one which will persist in refusing to recognize its antithesis until the antithesis is driven away. This can only be done by men who dwell in the divine society, society as revealed and inspired and led by Christ. For they know that the society of tension and antithesis, like the fashion of this world, is passing away; that the society of interacting and harmonious groups, where each recognizes the rights and duties both of others and of himself, and where each is consecrated to the well-being of an ever-

enlarging whole, is the true exemplar of the good life for men on earth; and that in Jesus, the pattern of all sonship, through whom men receive and share all that God can impart to the children of His love, the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

THE CONCEPTION OF COMMUNITY IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

By Prof. C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D.

The marked individualism of the Christian experience of salvation fostered by the Evangelical Revival (to go no further back than that) has tended to obscure from our minds the strongly communal character of that salvation in its historic beginnings. The background of the Gospel that Jesus proclaimed was the ideal notion of Israel as God's Chosen People. The new stress laid by Jeremiah and Ezekiel on the importance of the individual, and the markedly personal character of the religion fostered by Rabbinism, must not tempt us to forget that the religious life and mission of the Israelitish community as a whole formed the necessary context of each Israelite's own religious experience.

The same presupposition of a community-life, giving as it were validity and meaning to the religion of the individual, pervades also the teaching of the *New Testament*. It pervades in the first place the Gospels. Alongside of our Lord's searching approach and appeal to the individual, and His untiring concern with him, lay His customary stress on the concept of the Kingdom of God as central and fundamental to His whole message. The Kingdom can doubtless be viewed in its intensive or qualitative aspect, as the royal sovereignty of God; but equally needful to a complete understanding of it is the recognition of its extensive aspect, as represented by the community of those who recognize and obey that rule. The notion of a society of forgiven, redeemed, and obedient children of God is integral to Jesus's thought of the Kingdom.

When we pass to the Christianity of the Apostolic Age, the same is true. The individual Christian lives and expects to live as a member of a group. He never dreams of isolating himself from the other Christians of his locality. Not only does he stand in with them; but he thinks of himself as standing in with the whole Christian brotherhood throughout the world (*I Pet.* 2^{17}, 5^{9}), "all who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours" (*I Cor.* 1^{2}). Paul's various allusions to "the Church" are often ambiguous, namely, as to whether he means by the word in the singular the local community or the whole body of Christians on earth; but there is no doubt that the unity of the whole Christian body was regularly present to his mind. The personification of this body as the bride of Christ in *Eph.* $5^{25\text{-}33}$ is in line with Paul's thought, whether or not this epistle actually comes from his pen. True, the harmony of the communal life is often impaired by outbreaks of human frailty and wrong-headedness: some begin to forsake the assembling of themselves together (*Heb.* 10^{25}); sometimes schism and mutual excommunication occur (*2 John* 1^{7}; *3 John* 1^{9}). But no one ever imagines that the Christian life can be other than a communal life. It is taken for granted that all Christian communities throughout the world belong together, and form a unity more real than that of the great Roman Empire itself. In keeping with this strong conviction, the Church of the second and third centuries draws tight her organization, regularizes and unifies her standards and her procedure, and increases her corporate self-consciousness.

The old ideal was that the beloved community and human society generally should be co-extensive. This ideal, however, was conceivable only under the long-vanished conditions of a self-contained Chosen People living by themselves, or else as a dream of the great Future, which God would some day inaugurate, and which would involve the annihilation of all His enemies and the survival of the faithful remnant alone. Meanwhile, pending that happy consummation, the beloved community finds itself surrounded by a hostile majority, a great heathen society in contact with it at every point, and at once represented and directed by the Roman Imperial government. The attitude of the Christian Church to heathendom in the earliest period is both negative and positive. Negatively, Christians have to live separately from the world, to keep free from its contaminations, patiently to suffer its unkindness and its cruelty, and to refuse obedience to its commands when these are incompatible with the Law of God. Postively, however, they were to honour and pray for the Emperor, to obey him whenever his orders were not iniquitous, to take their part in the normal activities of society, and to serve all men in love. The classic exposition of this two-sided attitude is given by the anonymous author of the *Epistle to Diognetus*[1] (written about the middle of the second century):

> Christians are not distinct from the rest of men in country or language or customs. For neither do they dwell anywhere in cities of their own, nor do they use a different language, nor practise a conspicuous manner of life. . . . But dwelling in Greek and barbarian cities, as each man had been allotted, and following the customs of the country in dress and food and the rest of life, they display a wonderful manner of conduct and one confessedly beyond expectation. They inhabit their own fatherlands, but as sojourners; they participate in everything as citizens, and endure everything as foreigners. Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is a foreign country. . . . They live on the earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. They obey the established laws, and yet surpass the laws by their own lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all. They are not known, and (yet) they are condemned. They suffer death, and impart life. They are poor, and they make many rich. . . . They are dishonoured, and are glorified in the dishonour. . . . They are reviled, and they bless. . . . Doing good, they are punished as evil men. . . . . In a word, what the soul is to the body, that are Christians to the world. As the soul is disseminated throughout all the limbs of the body, so are Christians throughout the cities of the world. The soul dwells in the body, but is not of the body; and Christians dwell in the world, but are not of the world. The soul is guarded unseen within a body that is seen; and Christians are known to be in the world, but their religion remains unseen. The flesh hates the soul and wars on it, though unwronged by it, because the soul prevents it from enjoying its pleasures: and the world hates Christians though in no wise wronged by them, because they oppose its pleasures. The soul loves the flesh and the limbs that hate it, and Christians love those that hate them. The soul has been shut up in the body, but it holds the body together; and Christians are confined in the world as a prison; but they themselves hold the world together. The soul, though immortal, dwells in a mortal tabernacle; and Christians dwell amid corruptible things, awaiting the incorruption that is in heaven. The soul when stinted of food and drink improves; and Christians when punished

[1] V. f.

increase the more day by day. To such an office as this has God appointed them; and it is not lawful for them to decline it.

By the time that the Roman Empire in the person of Constantine the Great had finally desisted from persecuting the Christians and taken the Church under its wing, the Church's organization, as regards both creed and administration, had become much more unified and rigid. She now felt and realized her essential unity, and was in a condition to act as a unity far more definitely and effectively than at any earlier time. Her position of privilege and power led her to take up a much more positive and constructive attitude to the State. The State is no longer simply a part of the realm of heathen darkness, permitted by God and to be endured by the Church. The State is definitely a Divine institution, in the operations of which Christian men can unreservedly participate. Christian thinkers now identify the Stoic Law of Nature with the Hebrew Decalogue, and both as the ideal law of the State. In the *Civitas Dei* of Augustine, a fully-developed theory of the relations between Church and State is worked out. The Church is not yet conceived of as co-extensive with human society; but it is the senior partner and guide of the State which directs that society. The energies of the State are to be devoted, in obedience to the Church, to the task of bending

> the earthly order into conformity with the Divine; heretics and sinners must be coerced; . . . the task of the sovereign is to guard and enforce the Decalogue; . . .[2]

It is customary in many quarters to deplore this development of Church-life on account of the vast increase in worldliness and great lowering of ethical standards which necessarily accompanied it; yet it is impossible not to respect the effort that was made to grapple in a large way with the task that was now put before the Church—the task, namely, of building up a new and Christian civilization in Europe.

From this post-Constantinian stage, it was but the lapse of time and the normal process of development that produced the full-blown medieval conception of what Troeltsch has taught us to call the "church-type". Jewry, Islam, heathendom, and the dissident Eastern Church remain indeed as blots on the landscape: but to all intents and purposes the domain of the Church Catholic is co-extensive with civilized society. The Empire and the Church divide between them the lordship of the world. The adjustment of the relations between them presented some awkward problems and produced some fierce conflicts and some strange theories; but

> it was common ground to both sides that the *mundus Christianus* was a single whole with two aspects, sacred and secular, subject respectively to the bishop and the prince[3].

The Christian Church had now become a great and comprehensive organization, including all baptized persons, *i.e.*, in a rough way, all the inhabitants of the civilized States of Europe. It catered for the religious needs of the whole of European society, provided for every individual according to his personal position, graciously compromising with the frailties of the average man, and yet at the same time providing ample scope (in the monastic life) for those who aspired after Christian perfection. Through its Divinely-instituted sacraments it mediated to every man that precise measure of supernatural grace which was needful for his salvation. It stood up to Kings and Emperors, and boldly rebuked them when they transgressed. By representing differences of class and station as provi-

2 N. Micklem, *The Church Catholic*, 15. 3 *Ibid.*, 18.

dentially ordained, and enjoining an ethic of vocation with regard to them, it ministered to social stability, and was content to meet the worst evils of feudalism by the inculcation of almsgiving. It superintended the whole range of culture and education, unified the manifold achievements of philosophic and theological thought in a great system of doctrine, and issued instructions and admonitions to the whole world with the authority of God Himself.

Yet there were features in this medieval conception of human society which were bound sooner or later to bring about drastic change. To begin with, a ruthless intolerance of all individual or sectional dissent was a *sine qua non* of the maintenance of the medieval system; and this involved such a trampling on the rights of the human mind and conscience that an explosive outburst of revolt was only a matter of time. Added to this grave defect was the accumulation of such scandals as the exile of the Popes from Rome to Avignon, the Papal Schism, the immorality of the clergy and the monks, and above all the externalism and superstition which tied Christianity up with the vast paraphernalia of Catholic rites and observances, obscuring and so violating its inner spiritual essence.

The revolt developed in a number of forms and passed through various stages. First the Renaissance, with its revival of learning and consequent insistence on intellectual freedom. Then the great movement we call the Reformation, which produced in Lutheranism and Calvinism two interesting alternatives to the medieval community-ideal.

According to Luther, the world, as distinct from the Church, is full of evil, and is irredeemable before the Last Day. All its institutions and laws are concessions necessitated by human sin. The State cannot conform to strictly Christian standards: its law is the Natural Law of the Ten Commandments. The first impulse of the Christian man would be to withdraw altogether from the world, as the Catholic monk withdraws. But since God has placed him in the world, it is unlawful for him to flee from it: he must remain in it, and unresistingly bear whatever wrongs it inflicts upon him. Not only so, but since the State is appointed by God, the Christian must obey its orders, and even as magistrate and soldier participate in its activities, especially those directed to the restriction of crime.

Two serious weaknesses inhered in this world-view. Firstly, not only was the medieval dream of a union of Church and civilization given up, but all effort to improve political conditions by fostering liberty, and so on, was ruled out in advance. Secondly, all attempts to carry out the Christian ideals of the Sermon on the Mount (non-resistance, and so forth) were strictly limited to the inner life and attitude of the Christian. Luther rejected, indeed, the Catholic method of confining these ideals to the monastic and clerical orders: he insisted that they were obligatory for *all* Christians; but, in the interests of social stability, he excluded them from practical life and confined them strictly to the realm of thought and feeling. Luther later modified his doctrines of the Divine Right of Kings and of the consequent wrongfulness of resisting them, so far as to sanction war against the Catholic Emperor in the interests of Protestantism: but his holy horror of all concrete formulation of Christian duty permanently disqualified him for the task of re-shaping the Christian community-ideal. At the same time his unsystematized adherence to certain phases of medieval ecclesiasticism, alongside of more spiritual Protestant notions, rendered his doctrine of the Church to a great extent chaotic and unprogressive.

Calvin's theory of Church and State was at once more closely-knit and less pessimistic that Luther's. Calvin refused to recognize any difference between the ethical standards of the Sermon on the Mount and those of

the *Old Testament*. He did not need therefore to relegate the State, as Luther did, to a sub-Christian level, and to regard it only as a concession to human sin. For him, it was a direct Divine institution, intrinsically good, one of the many blessings God had conferred on the human race. The Christian must, of course, participate to the full in its activities; but in doing so, he has no need to bemoan any temporary submission to a second best in which Christian values are compromised: he is fulfilling a dignified duty, fully in keeping with the Christian ideal. All secular callings, commercial and industrial as well as political, must be penetrated by the Christian spirit of those who take part in them. Between the Christian pastor and the civil magistrate, there is no divergence of ideals, but only a division of labour. While the magistrate undertakes the lower or executive duties, the Church superintends the higher task of directing the legislative side of the community's life. Calvin's theory is thus genuinely theocratic; and though not directly teaching equality on democratic lines, yet, by insisting on the Church's independence of the State, it did indirectly foster democratic ideals. Corresponding to his healthier and more positive view of the State, was his healthier and more positive view of work and trade. Unlike Luther, who regarded work as a punishment for human sin, Calvin dignified it as a holy God-given task, in which the Christian man might, if he would, fully live out all his Christian ideals.

Yet Calvin, like Luther, failed to do justice to the characteristic ethics of the Gospel. Though following a different line of thought, he arrived at what was practically the same conclusion, *viz.*, that the Christian man must not in practice try to conform to the Sermon on the Mount. The non-resistance teaching of that Sermon, Calvin taught, was never meant to apply to anything more than man's inner temper, motive, and disposition. For *practical* purposes, therefore, it simply did not count.

There was, however, another factor at work, deeply affecting Christian thoughts and ideals regarding community life—a factor of far-reaching and sinister import: I mean, the rise of nationalism. The Reformation was not in any way the cause of nationalism; it had already begun to show itself strongly in the fifteenth century. But in certain quarters and for a certain time nationalism and religious Reformation were bound to help one another. The sense of national unity and independence gave powerful support to the anti-Roman movement started by Luther in Germany, and the corresponding feeling in England had long been preparing the way for Henry VIII's successful defiance of the Pope. And if a nation as such had rights of its own, analogy suggested that every independent political unit, such as the typical German principality, had similar rights, even though it did not in any real way represent a nation. Thus it was that the German revolt against Rome led first to sanguinary struggles against the half-Dutch, half-Spanish Emperor; and later, when these struggles issued in a sort of stalemate, it led to the adoption of the unsatisfying expedient represented by the formula *Cujus regio, eius religio*. So firmly and widely fixed had the conception of the State as a Divinely-ordained institution now become, that the determination of the one religious worship to be tolerated within the limits of the particular State was henceforth to depend on the personal beliefs and preferences of its political head.

Meanwhile, while this lame and impotent conclusion—not to mention the incessant occurrence of inter-State wars—was showing the doctrine of the sovereign independent State to be creating more problems than it solved, the total failure of both Luther and Calvin to find a proper place for the Christian ethical ideal gave rise to experimentation in another direction—on the part, namely, of the so-called Anabaptist sects. The

conviction that believer's baptism and that alone was valid was only one of the many characteristics shared by these interesting groups. Their outstanding feature—from our point of view—was their ready disregard of the Great Church, whether that of Rome or of the sovereign Protestant State, in the interests of a more intensive and thorough obedience to the full Christian ideal on the part of all members of the local group. The Anabaptists felt that the practical loyalty of members to the pure ethics of the Gospel was the first concern of any genuine Church-group; and they united accordingly on that basis. They were thus relieved of the painful necessity of playing fast and loose with the fifth of *Matthew,* as in different ways Rome, Luther, and Calvin had all done: moreover, by welcoming to their fellowship, not all and sundry who had been baptized as infants, but only those wholeheartedly set on living out the full Christian standard of perfection, they were able in some measure to reproduce the conditions of Christian community-life as these had existed in the days of the Apostolic Church. But for such advantages they had to pay a heavy price. They had to discard a great deal of what the rest of the world viewed, not only as true, but as sacrosanct, and to incur in an age of ruthless intolerance all the penalties for so doing. In 1527 one Michael Sattler was put to a cruel death at Rottenburg for having taught that the body and blood of Christ did not exist in the Sacrament, that children ought not to be baptized, that oaths ought not to be taken to superiors, or armed resistance offered to the Turks, and that the saints ought not to be invoked. And he was only one of a great multitude of Anabaptist martyrs. But cruel persecution was not the only penalty which these good people incurred. They incurred also the reproach—levelled at them in that day as in this, and levelled not by Catholics alone—that they were absurdly disloyal to their fellow-Christians in severing themselves from them, and in trying to erect a form of community-life which, just because it had room only for the perfect, was in its very nature impracticable, and therefore unacceptable as an ideal for the Christian Church. They exemplified *par excellence* what Troeltsch calls "the sect-type", represented off and on down the Christian centuries in a variety of forms by Montanists, Novatianists, Donatists, Priscillianists, Waldenses, Albigenses, Anabaptists, Elizabethan Separatists, and Quakers.

We as Free-Churchmen have much of this "sect-type" in our ecclesiastical make-up; and however much we may approve of and admire the freedom which that method of Christian organization gives from the trammels of ecclesiastical compromise, and however indignantly we may deplore and condemn the brutal persecution inflicted on its adherents at various times, we must in honesty face the difficulties with which consistent adherence to the "sect-type" in religion faces us. We have to-day become so accustomed to a divisive or sectarian type of Christianity that we do not realize as we should how poor is the best expression we to-day can give to the true Catholicity of the one Church of Christ on earth, and how hard it has become for the Christian community to make its voice clearly heard in the world, even regarding those matters on which all Christians, broadly speaking, are agreed. How much this poverty and inability matter in these days of rampant paganism can hardly be exaggerated.

In offering these comments on the Anabaptist ideal, I have passed on really to the final stage of development, I mean, the age of our modern religious liberties. The old idea of unifying the whole of civilized humanity under the leadership of a single ecclesiastical organization has long since passed away. The Roman Church, retaining her pretentious phraseology and her superiority in size, is still able, by excluding and ignoring all other religious groups, to parade before the eyes of the gullible as the one

Church of Christ on earth. The Eastern Orthodox Church makes the same claim, only less aggressively and efficiently. But all idea of coercing the individual into obedience to Rome because, as a baptized person, he is legally subject to her has totally disappeared. All that Rome can do by way of coercion is to take advantage of exceptional political situations, in order to prevail on the State, now in Italy, now in Spain, to lend its coercive and punitive power for the affliction of non-Catholic worshippers. High Anglicanism envisages the embodiment of the one universal Church in the three episcopally-governed groups—Rome, the Church of England, and the East. The various Protestant bodies maintain their own corporate life with varying degrees of seriousness and success: but none of them has any satisfactory solution to offer to the problem of Christian disunion, and most of them, alas, are totally unaware of any problem to be solved. Some denominations cultivate a very high standard of intensive or qualitative Churchmanship; but none seems to feel any need to knit up again the rents in the seamless robe. The need is indeed felt by isolated individuals here and there, but they usually start searching for a solution in a direction in which it is little likely to be found, *viz.*, in businesslike negotiations whereby the several Christian bodies can agree on a tabulated scheme of terms of union, one ceding this preference and another ceding that, in the hope that, when a working agreement on essentials has been reached, true reunion will follow. The weak point in all such schemes is that they make no provision for the individual who dissents from the agreed scheme. They have no option but to shut him out, however true a Christian he may be. This is because they register only an insufficient trust in human freedom, in the overruling Providence of God, and in the unifying force of Truth. The only safe and promising way forward must be one that starts from the principle of an inclusive mutual recognition based on the common profession of faith in the one Lord Jesus Christ. The Congregational denomination is the one body possessed of traditions and principles that provide straightaway for this inclusive Catholicity: but to bring Congregationalists to realize the true Catholicity of their principles and to exploit their position of advantage in the service of a truly Catholic doctrine and scheme of Christian unity—*hic labor, hoc opus est.*

In regard to the conception of community in the non-ecclesiastical spheres of politics and social life, the stage of world-history is at present unfortunately dominated by an epidemic insanity in the form of a totalitarian theory of the State. Whether that theory be of the Marxist or of the Fascist colour, it is equally dictatorial and equally damnable. In Italy's murderous attack on Abyssinia we have but the latest manifestation of the inherent immorality of such a theory of society: and in the condoning of that attack by the Roman Church one more convincing proof that that Church has no claim to speak in the name of Christ. Origen used to teach that when men sin obstinately and perversely, God lets them go on in their sin until they grow sated with it and come to loath it. Our hope in regard to the love of so many modern nations for iniquitous dictatorships is that this love will at long last be cured in the same humbling way. And perhaps the only help that we can render its victims in the meantime is to expedite the process of disillusionment by remaining utterly and humbly loyal ourselves in word and deed to the Christian standards of truth and justice.

The discussion of the bearing of this rough historical sketch on the central problem of the Christian doctrine of community must be confined to a few very simple considerations.

The Christian individualism with which most of us here are familiar is often accused in various quarters of being misguided because it is based

on an unreality. The isolated individual presupposed as its unit, it is said, does not exist. If this means that all individual life is lived in a social context, that the individual is largely fashioned by the social conditions in the midst of which he is born, that he ought to take his communal relationships and obligations very seriously and to hearken reverently to the wishes of his fellows—all this we may willingly grant; and I am not aware that our Christian individualism has ever involved a denial of these truths. The criticism in question, however, is sometimes thought to prove that the authority of the community over the individual is absolute and unconditional, that in matters of political responsibility the individual, because indebted (as he clearly is) to the community, ceases in some way to be an autonomous and responsible moral unit. This error is by no means the monopoly of the totalitarian States to which we have just been alluding. We find it on the lips or else implied in the arguments of eminent Christian thinkers in England, when, *e.g.*, they dissuade the Christian individual from following the admittedly Christian ideal of pacifism, on the ground that society and the State are not yet ready for it, but have nonetheless a claim on his co-operation. Over against all such attacks on Christian individualism, I would submit, firstly, that the prerogative of wielding *unconditional* authority belongs to God alone, and the claim of any human person or group or institution to exercise it is a usurpation; and secondly, that since society is what men make it, the redemption of the individual (which is the characteristic task of the Christian Church) is also the most fundamental contribution that can be made to the redemption of society.

I am not forgetting that the adjustment of the relations between individual autonomy and the right of a man's fellowmen to put disciplinary pressure on him remains over as a very thorny and urgent problem. It is, however, clear that, like most problems of adjustment, this problem too is incapable of being solved by the total suppression of either of the two factors to be adjusted. The hope for a satisfactory solution rests on the assurance that what is inherently right and good will in the long run commend itself to the judgment of all men, thus eliminating in a natural way the tension between the individual and his fellows, though doubtless much travail must be endured pending the attainment of that desirable consummation.

There is, however, one consideration which I should like in closing to advance, as bidding fair to relieve some at least of the travail to which I have referred. It is this: just because individuals are bound to view things differently, the thing that seems morally right for one man will often be different from what seems morally right to another. As duty consists of what seems morally right to a man, this means that one man's duty will not always be the same as another's. Just as there is a variety of χαρίσματα in the Christian Church, so there is a variety of moral standards in the community generally. Our tacit recognition of the wisdom of tolerance is an unconscious recognition of this relative rightness of differing moral standards. Such a recognition need not be dreaded as a sceptical denial of all absolute moral values. It ought to be exempt from that reproach for two reasons: (1) *all* our moral standards are approximate only, when compared with the absolute standard which is the ideal Will of God: they differ, in approaching more or less closely to that absolute ideal: even the better standards therefore contain some degree of imperfection, and the less good standards may therefore be recognized as containing at least some degree of objective good. (2) This recognition of the relative justification of the more imperfect standards does not involve the recognizer in deserting his own less imperfect standard, so far as his personal contact and propaganda are concerned.

The application of such a principle of relative justification to the problem of peace, for instance, would be a great gain. It would enable the pacifist without inconsistency to recognize the good that has in the past been wrought in the world, and that may yet be wrought in it, by the conscientious and unselfish use even of violent coercion. It would also enable him to meet the oft-repeated criticism that he is ahead of his time and ought not to impose his ideal prematurely on a society that is not ready for it. And it would enable him to do both these things without having, for consistency's sake, to abandon his own personal adherence to and advocacy of his pacifist convictions. I have adduced pacifism as an example because that problem is very much before the Christian mind just now, and because arguments concerning it generally fail to come mutually to grips for lack of the recognition of the very principle I am here expounding. But I believe the principle is of very general application to all matters where the ethical conduct of the individual in relation to his communal responsibilities is concerned.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY.

By Dr. F. E. England, M.A., B.D.

One of the outstanding characteristics of 20th century thought is the substitution of the conception of *co-operation* for the 19th century notion of *rivalry* as the keynote of evolution and progress. The Darwinian view of organisms as engaged in a perpetual struggle to survive by competitive aggressiveness and predacity has been radically modified, and we now realize that inherent in the life even of infra-human beings is a co-operative impulse which determines the creature to adjust itself to the activities and development of other creatures. Far down the scale of life, among the Protozoa, this impulse gave rise to a kind of colonization which led the way to multicellular modes of life, and as we ascend the scale we are impressed by the extension of this same impulse toward co-ordination and symbiosis. In man the gregarious instinct was from the first as powerful as, or even more powerful than, the competitive. The family instinct modified the working of natural selection, and in the very struggle for existence it was not the individual but the family or the tribe which was the real unit. The force of the struggle was broken for the individual and laid upon the social unit, the community. Moreover, the struggle is no longer to be conceived as destructive, but as determined by constructive social ends. As Benjamin Kidd pointed out, the primary motive in human progress was the wellbeing of the social group, while the interests of the individual were definitely subordinated to those of the community. Human life then is fundamentally social, and in the individual the social instincts are at least as primary as the self-instincts. To recall some words of John Caird[1]:—

> It is impossible to understand the individual as an individual—without reference, *i.e.*, to the social environment in which he lives, and the history of the family, the nation, the race to which he belongs. As an isolated individual he is as unintelligible as a severed limb if we know nothing of the body to which it belongs. His consciousness involves the life and consciousness of others, and is steeped in the thought and life of the intellectual and moral atmosphere in which he lives. Take away from him all that is his by inheritance, all that is

1 *University Addresses*, 267.

> in him simply as a relation to other beings around him—all affection and sympathy, language and the ideas dependent on it, beliefs, habits, customs, conventions which grow out of his social life, all that is in him as a member of a particular family, as participating in the spirit and genesis of a particular nation, as the child of this century and not of any prior one, as breathing the spirit of his own time—take away all these constituents of his being, and what you have left is not the man but a bare abstraction.

Historically, the conduct of the individual was determined by the sanctions of the group; morality, as the term *mores* implies, was crystallized out of social customs or primitive ways in which the members of the group behaved. And the social customs originated not from rational restrictions set upon some alleged primary individualism, but from utility. The tribes of men never held conferences to determine what should be regarded as binding upon their members. Their social and therefore their moral customs grew out of their gregariousness, just as the regulations of bees and ants were fashioned by habitual conduct.

In view of these considerations it is surprising to find that those psychologists who follow Freud's leadership take the view that society had its origin in sexual rivalry and its consequences. In his earlier writings where Freud treated the individual life in abstraction from its social setting, he affirms that all social tendencies are inhibited forms of sexual impulse. The manifestations of sexuality and those of sociality are antagonistic, and for the purposes of the social life the *libido,* which is the energy of sex, must needs be inhibited and modified. The inhibiting is not applied by any exalted moral standard but itself depends on sex jealousy. In *Totem and Taboo* (1912) Freud depicts a condition of sexual jealousy and suspicion which prompts the father to expel his immature sons. On the attainment of maturity the sons kill the obstructive father and eat him. Thereupon, seized with remorse, they become a community of repentant beings, integrated by their common guilt and remorse. Thus the primitive group was founded upon sexual rivalry. In the same work, Freud argues that all social attitudes and customs are likewise founded upon the *Oedipus* complex. The attitude of every child toward his father is said to be "ambivalent." He seeks his father's protection and care, yet he hates him because he possesses the mother, on whom the child's own sexual *libido* is centred. The sexual jealousy is normally repressed by his regard for his father as protector, and the inhibition is the creator of taboo, conscience, duty, and social custom. The totem feast, in which the totem is the father-substitute, is said by Freud to be the commemoration of this criminal act from which sprang social organization, morality, and religion.

Now apart from the fantastic character of Freud's doctrine it appears to me quite inexplicable how he can possibly imagine altruistic conduct to have emerged from a purely sexual urge. He artlessly inserts remorse and guilt without suggesting how they can be deduced from the *libido* which in his view is the one primal urge. And as we should expect, he falls into contradiction and confusion at every turn. For example : he used to call in the services of a mythical censor to repress the unwelcome libidinous tendencies—but without explaining whence the censor got its commission or its power. Next (in the *New Lectures*), he assigned the repressing function to the ego and afterwards to the super-ego (which becomes the special enforcer of moral precepts). But Freud realized that he had gone too far in the direction of admitting a moral principle which did not fit in with his original scheme. He therefore conceived the idea

of inventing the name "Death-instinct" (*New Lectures,* 139) and contended that instead of thinking of the sexual instincts confronting the ego, we should think of the sex instincts as the integrating instincts, making always for what he calls "larger unities", and we should think of all non-libidinous impulses as death-instincts because of their destructiveness. In this way Freud seeks to avoid bringing in a moral agent *ab extra.* But it is far from being successful, for not only have we the absurd result that the death-instinct by its destructiveness has created the social life, but as Freud says (*New Lectures,* 123) the death-instinct itself, just because it is destructive, requires to be repressed in the interests of society, and we are not told by what repression the repressor itself shall be repressed.

Curiously enough Flügel, who accepts the Freudian doctrine that all social activities derive from sex and are sustained by the *libido,* and that sexual inhibitions ultimately depend indirectly upon jealousy, is found making the paradoxical assertions that sex-jealousy is both the foundation stone of society and its greatest peril.

Nothing would seem to be more clear than that even on Freud's own premises something other than sex-jealousy is to be postulated in the human breast if we are to offer any explanation of the origin of society. Dr. Ian Suttie[2] makes the interesting suggestion that the first jealousy is not sexual jealousy but nurtural jealousy, a jealousy originating in a group consisting of mother and *children.* The true group we might say would not then be Adam, Eve, and Cain, but Eve, Cain, and Abel; and the true rivalry between Cain and Abel for nurtural preference. Suttie shows that this jealousy implies a love which is not sexual or possessive but a love which is essentially social. The child, he argues, is not at first aware of himself, but of mother in relation to himself. The love of mother is not selfish but social; it expresses social adjustment and, later, fellowship. Suttie goes on to argue that it is not from love of power that we seek to get into right relations with others, but in order to be assured of their love, just as in infancy we are assured of mother-love. Fellowship, not rivalry, is the keynote of human life.

This means the rejection of the primacy of the sexual *libido,* and the conception of social fellowship as the δύναμις or implied goal of all the ἐνέργεια or striving of the human individual. That is to say, in order to account for the formation of the human community we are obliged to posit in the human soul a social impulse which is at least co-ordinate with the self-instincts.

Accepting the fact that man is by nature a social animal, we now encounter the obvious fact that the individual is never completely social. There are elements within him which remain recalcitrant to, and dissatisfied with, and unexpressed in, the social life. The fundamental problem for the community itself is the right defining of the mutual relations of the individual and the group. All social theories are concerned with this problem, and however differently they define the relations, all recognize that the interests of the individual and those of the social organism are not identical. The term individual originally meant something incapable of being divided. It was the word ἄτομον whence came our word *atom* —something that must be taken as an indivisible whole. Cicero translated ἄτομον by *individuum,* which gradually came to mean *unique* or particular. As we have seen, however, the human individual was never the fundamental unit. The story of the early stages of civilization presents the individual as a constituent of a society, inseparable from it, his very existence being dependent upon his vital connexion with the community,

2 *The Origins of Love and Hate.*

his rights being subordinate to the requirements of the community. As life developed, however, the tendency was in the direction of more individual power; we find the individual gaining in independence, criticizing the basis of the traditional social order, and asserting his own private judgment. As such, he appeared to be a menace to the community, and it became necessary to determine the limits of his originality of idea and action. It was in the process of working out these limits that social custom, morality and law were evolved—not with a view to *creating* the community life, which was indeed the product of intellectual activity, but to regulating the already existing community life.

What we have so far then is individual-in-relation-to-community or, in other words, man is motivated by two co-ordinate instinctual urges, the one seeking self-fulfilment, the other social co-operation. In general, there have been three ways in which social philosophers have represented analogically the relation between the self and the group. First was the essentially Greek idea of organization, dear to the Stoic mind. In the living organism the organs are relatively independent and yet harmoniously related to the rest of the whole. Detach the organ and it perishes, and the whole is made weaker. Let any one organ be overdeveloped beyond a certain point and there is trouble in the whole. Then there was Plato's conception of a hierarchic society, in which every part had its own special work. This underlay the feudal system, in which the functions of the individual were determined by the functions of some higher individual, right up to a single all-commanding control. In contrast with both these analogies, which assigned little or no independent significance to the individual, was the microcosmic view, according to which the individual was a veritable centre where reality as a whole found expression. This was the Neo-Platonic conception of human life and it received new expression in the monadology of Leibniz. Our modern world reflects something of all three tendencies; the first is presupposed in communism, the second in dictatorships, and the third in political and educational theories of the Romantic Movement mainly deriving from Herbart and Pestalozzi, who laid the main stress upon the development of the individual as such, with all the characteristics inherent in him. In the first two theories the purpose of life is the well-being of the community; in the third it is the full development of the individual. Modern social life in any of its forms would appear to be an unstable compromise leaning either toward individualism or collectivism. No human society yet exists in which man's capacities for communal intercourse with his fellows are fully expressed.

The tension between individual and group has certain definite psychological causes, to which I now direct your notice. All the fundamental instincts in human nature are derived from the three biological urges, namely maintenance, irritability, and reproduction. The maintenance urge provides the foundation for the *self* group of instincts (food-seeking, health-seeking, liberty, peace of mind, and pride of self). Biological irritability, greatly refined, becomes the basis of the environmental instincts (inquisitiveness, investigation, discovery, acquisitiveness, escape). The reproductive function gives rise to the more definitely social instincts (gregariousness, competitiveness, mating, and the parental instincts). These are the foundation stones of every normal individual life. Together with their affective-accompaniments they constitute the mechanism of response to the rest of reality. They are hereditary patterns which have been shaped by human intercourse with reality. They are ways in which the individual is stimulated to react to influences outside

himself, inciting him towards ends satisfying to himself and harmonious with the activity of the community in which he lives.

Centuries of modification and refinement have sublimated these instincts and fitted them to be the ground plan of all human intercourse, and I am going to suggest that the community life is the creation of these instincts, harmoniously expressed and exercised for the good of the whole, while anti-social conduct is marked by a relapse into crude biological and individual uses.

(1) Consider the instinct of pugnacity or assertiveness. At first sight it may appear to be quite anti-social. In reality, however, it rarely expresses itself in sheer antagonism. It may even possess a certain social value as when it is exercised in the service of loyalty to one's country. When, however, it is expressed at the *infra*-human level of mere self-assertiveness or self-defence it becomes an anti-social thing. When it is expressed at the level of primitive communities it becomes an instrument either of selfish aggressiveness or narrow nationalism. The history of communities might almost be written on the theme of the power-impulse and its frustration. A complex affective attitude in which resentment is the dominant feature is common among those who are, or imagine they are, at a disadvantage in life. It is an attitude born of envy, or a sense of being the underdog; the attitude of the weak toward the strong, of the poor towards the rich. Doubtless there have been many occasions when the more talented among the resentful have voiced the wrongs of their fellows and by revolutionary methods have compelled a revision of the accepted standards. At all events the antagonism between master and slave has always profoundly affected social progress.

A vast amount of unredeemed pugnacity in the social life of our day is to be seen in the realm of industrialism. The industrial life of the community is still based largely on the crude principle that I have a *right* to get what I have the *power* to get. The power to get is rarely expressed in force of arms; but it is expressed in economic privilege—than which nothing in the material realm is more powerful. This privilege is not necessarily a reward for services rendered to the community, but may be gained by no more significant event than the death of a distant uncle. The privilege is held as a right and is exercised by many who contribute nothing in the way of service to the community. I am not thinking of the successful business man whose industry and capacities for organization have built up a large business employing thousands of men, nor of the person who inherits wealth which he continues to use for the benefit of his fellows. Both may be rendering an immense service to the community. I am thinking of the person who receives a large income from capital owned by him out of all relation to any function he performs, except to control the destinies of others by his manipulation of a large part of the capital wealth of the community for purely selfish purposes. Wealth confers power; and my point is that he who exercises power in a community without rendering equivalent services to the community is acting anti-socially. From the social standpoint the only legitimate exercise of the power impulse is the use of wealth, influence, and position, for the good of the whole, and it must be admitted that many noble heroisms of this kind stand to the credit of social reformers.

(2) As an illustration of the use and misuse of the second group of instincts underlying the community life I select the instinct of *acquisitiveness* as one of the most important.

Without doubt this instinct has been largely instrumental in the development of the community life, and particularly in the creation of our

present industrial civilization. The acquirement and enjoyment of property or other form of wealth cannot be said to be anti-social in itself, for had it not been for the acquisitive instinct there would have been no property, no security, and therefore no stable community. It cannot, however, be disputed that social progress has largely consisted in the wide extension of facilities for the pursuit and possession of objects not necessary for survival or security. Social progress was enormously facilitated by the production of a surplus over and above that which is necessary to sustain and preserve life. At first the surplus was a surplus of corn and other products of the earth, and it was by the use of these products that inter-community relationships developed. Under the Industrial Revolution, owing to the immensely increased output resulting from the use of machinery, the surplus produced is excessive, and the facilities for acquisitiveness greatly extended.

Now, as Dr. R. H. Tawney has many times argued, acquisitiveness is an evil when it exists in a society which protects economic rights without demanding economic functions. Let me quote one paragraph :—

> A society which aimed at making the acquisition of wealth contingent upon the discharge of social obligations, which sought to proportion remuneration to service and denied it to those by whom no service was performed . . . might be called a functional society because in such a society the main subject of social emphasis would be the performance of functions. But such a society does not exist, even as a remote ideal, in the modern world. Modern societies aim at protecting economic rights, while leaving economic functions to fulfil themselves.

And the protection of economic rights, out of relation to social functions performed, is an anti-social procedure.

(3) Turning now to the third group of instincts which underlie individual and social life, we observe that all peoples found it necessary to safeguard these instincts in the interests of the wellbeing of the community. Where their use was inadequately regulated by social sanctions we find deterioration and decay in the body politic. In our day there exists considerable doubt about the wise regulation of these instincts, particularly the parental and mating instincts. In the first place the parental instinct is controlled by expediency and the result is a falling birthrate among the professional classes. As to the mating instinct, economic conditions are regulative here also, but the problem of regulating the mating instinct is mainly aggravated not by economic conditions but by the entirely new attitude toward sex matters.

I want to suggest that there are three distinct levels at which sexual activity subsists. The first corresponds to the infantile level which is instinctual and imitative, all activity being regulated by pleasurable well-being and the avoidance of pain. At this infant level, sexual activity is expressed in certain forms of auto-sexuality, such as the practice of self-stimulation or a pre-occupation with the sex organs. When this is carried forward into the later stages of life we get masturbation and promiscuity. These sexual expressions are based on mere individual gratification and lead to anti-social results. Accordingly there is a second level at which social sanctions become operative; and sexual activity is regulated by social restraints, the fear of punishment or ostracism, the inculcation of social ideals, the dissemination of information about the baneful effects of venereal disease and about the hygiene of purity. Likewise the legitimate functions of sex are safeguarded by social legislation and practice. The

institutions of marriage and the family are social institutions designed to preserve the integrity of the community. Marriage is a legalized social contract, and sexual relations are legitimate only within that contract. From the point of view of the community, sexual intercourse is a function regulated by law; and in a monogamous community, sexual intercourse outside the legalized married state is condemned as anti-social. The libertine is a person whose sexual impulses are expressed in an individualist and anti-social way, just as the tyrant expresses his power-impulse or the thief his acquisitive instinct in an anti-social manner.

Consideration of the sex problem brings out in clearer light what is in some measure implied in the problems of power and acquisitiveness. So far we have observed the contrast and clash between individual or selfish activities on the one hand and social activity on the other. The industrialist is anti-social in so far as he snatches what he can get because he is powerful or indulges any other purely self-interested impulse.

There is, however, a level of activity which transcends the social as the social transcends individual or selfish activity. In certain situations a man may exercise power or acquisitiveness not in his own interests nor for the wellbeing of the community as at present constituted. In the clash between Jesus and the people of His day, the Master was acting from no motive of self-interest, nor did He act in accordance with the community-ideals of His time; He was in fact adjudged to be anti-social. And every reformer who has gone ahead of his time and struck a blow against the heart of his community has likewise demonstrated the fact that there is something higher and greater than social activity, and it is probable that all forms of totalitarianism will ultimately be wrecked on the rock not of anti-social conduct but of conduct which transcends social motive.

Perhaps in no department does the transcendence of social motive come out more clearly than in respect of sexual activities. Sexual intercourse may, I have said, be a purely individual and selfish act. Or it may be perfectly accordant with long-established social regulation and legitimatized by social law. But we are coming to see that there is something in the sexual relationship which transcends social purposes and the functional requirements of the social life. Most of us no longer believe that the only praiseworthy function of sexual intercourse is to produce children. On the contrary, some of us think it anti-social and immoral for physically defective or indigent parents to produce children. But we do not believe it to be immoral to continue sexual relations. We are beginning to understand that the sexual function, which has its roots in a biological urge, is capable of being taken up into a more sacred relationship and becoming the instrument of a high fellowship and of personal enrichment.

Professor John Macmurray has argued that there are two ways in which we may enter into relations with our fellows. We can associate with them in order to achieve some purpose that we all share; and out of this springs a life of social co-operation through which we can provide for our common needs and achieve common ends. But in these social relationships we give ourselves only in part; we act functionally as postmen or gardeners or teachers and so forth. But we have other ends in view, other purposes which cannot be expressed save by giving our entire selves, without reserve or suppression; which demand a closer relation than social relations; which in short can be expressed only in the atmosphere of the intimacies of friendship and love. And because these things are based on no *particular* interests, serve no social ends, but are

simply and only the means of living a fully personal life, the social life is to that extent a limited life; it does not embrace the most characteristic activities of a full personality. Full personal expression is impossible save where the person can express his whole self without social inhibition.

Apply this to the question of sexual relationships, and it becomes manifestly clear that there is a sexual relationship which is higher and greater than that which is established by social law for social reasons. If sexual intercourse, even within the married state, is merely functional, if it exist either for mere bodily gratification or merely for producing children *without any real sharing of personalities,* if in short it be not the expression of complete fellowship and love and if it be not a means of enriching that intimate and unfettered relationship, the sex act may be accordant with social morality but it is immoral in the Christian sense of the term moral, immoral because based upon an external contract and not upon the law of love.

A very big problem confronts us here, and unless we understand it clearly we may find some sections of public opinion going in advance of the teaching of the Church about sexual relationships. From the fact that the social institutions of marriage and the family are being repudiated by large numbers of people, Prof. Macmurray argues that there is in the social order something that calls for drastic reconstruction. When an institution becomes a hindrance to the full development of personal life, it becomes, he argues, "a festering sore in the body of humanity". He insists that the development of the personal life of humanity should take precedence of all merely social and institutional demands. And if this means that some people who are not married will have sexual relations, Macmurray seriously puts it forward[3] that "in the interests of morality we must run the risk of that".

There is no doubt, I think, that Macmurray has elucidated one of the most delicate and difficult problems of our age; but I venture to argue that his treatment of the problem is weakened by the omission of one very important consideration. While recognizing that the social life needs to be safeguarded against the dangers of individualist anti-social conduct, he does not realize that safeguards are no less necessary for the "full development of personal lives". In the first place, precautions would have to be taken against the counterfeiting of personal freedom. I venture to say that a large number of members of almost any given community would be found ready to say that they could give themselves more completely and fully to persons other than their own wives and husbands. But by what criterion is one to decide whether the real motive in each case is individualist and selfish, or personal and exalted? Probably all would feel assured that the new relationship would enhance the personalities of both—that is just what has led to easy divorce in America and still more in Russia. But many people even in those countries are beginning to frown upon a procedure which tends toward the promiscuity which strikes at the heart of community life.

But in the second place, Prof. Macmurray has done less than justice to the fact that what he describes as the full development of personal life requires a discipline immensely more severe than that which holds communities together, for it is based not upon external sanctions but upon the compulsions of a higher loyalty. Turn back for a moment to the other activities we have been considering, the power impulse and acquisitiveness. They, like sexual activities, may also be expressed at three levels. The exercise of power or acquisitiveness may be for *selfish purposes*, for

3 *Reason and Emotion*, 115.

social interests, or for the *enhancement of personalities in mutual relations.* But however exercised, power, acquisitiveness, and sexuality are expressed within the community and affect the life of the community. The life of free persons cannot be cut off from the life of the community as a whole. The freest and most highly developed personality is *in* the world though not *of* the world. He is called upon to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's as well as rendering unto God the things that are God's. He can in fact develop his personality only in relation to others. Stylites is not a good example of well-developed personality.

Free personalities, those who live for wholeness of personal life, are required to live in the social order if only to transform it, and for them the problem is not one of living in two separate worlds but of living in a world within a world. It is when people imagine that the world of personal relationships can be divorced from the world of social relationships that they become *absolute* pacifists (*i.e.*, people who refuse to wield social power in order that they may gain spiritual results); or *ascetics* (*i.e.*, people who repudiate social possessions in order that they may gain spiritual wealth); or *free lovers* (*i.e.*, people who deny the social sanctions in order to achieve spiritual love). By doing so, however, these people tend to run away from the real problem as set by Jesus Christ, the task of redeeming society from the inside, of leavening the whole lump. Merely to argue that in the development and expression of full personality the risk of anti-social conduct must be taken is to suggest a contrast within the community of an aristocratic minority like that envisaged by some Hellenistic Stoic writers, or even like that advocated by Nietzsche, who maintained that freedom was for the few while the masses were fitted for only a slave-morality.

The problem of adjusting one's social and spiritual loyalties has always been acute for Christian people. Jesus Himself appears to have envisaged small groups, and even individuals, achieving fullness of personal life not by forsaking the community or avoiding its obligations, but by setting above all social loyalties a new loyalty to Himself and His Father. This new loyalty not only gave them a sense of living in the glorious liberty of the children of God, but it bound them together into a new community within a community. Numerically the Church has always been a community within a wider social whole, but in reality the community which is represented in the life of the Church is incomparably wider than the social whole. And it is our conviction that in this wider world which is the kingdom of God, men and women enter into that fullness of life which they sorely lack in the social order. Here the smaller self is denied that a larger self may come to birth. Here we still exercise our functions within the social group, still handle the merchandise of the social life, still maintain and uphold the social institutions in so far as they are required to give cohesion to the community; but power, acquisitiveness, and fellowship are all motivated by the central desire to transform the whole society into the Kingdom of God upon earth. In the eyes of Christ, the community was not a mere collection of individuals or a mere political group; it was a family of God's children; and what He desired most of all was to see spreading through the community a fellowship which melted all self-concern, all strife, and all worldliness, and solved all social problems in the atmosphere of Divine love.

The transcendence of the secular community life is not a withdrawal from that life, nor is the conduct of the free personality necessarily anti-social. The Christian individual adjusts his life to dual relationships. The fact that he enjoys shelter, food, and clothing, brings him willy-nilly

into the social order and into economic relationship with the rest of the community. Yet, at the same time, his citizenship is in heaven; his loyalties are centred there. Thence he derives the ultimate motive which operates through all other intentions. For him to live is Christ, and he does all to the glory of God. His individuality remains, but it is enriched by being hid with Christ in God. He is never a *mere* individual; he is a person related to other persons. In the community of free souls his relationship is still functional but no longer partial. In the life of the secular community he contributes of his functions for the social good; in the kingdom of souls he gives himself in complete consecration to God. He no longer lives unto himself nor is his life controlled by the legislation of the society. He is free, not because he is exempt from or repudiates social obligation, but because the Son has made him free. He is no longer a servant performing duties within a community that possesses him, but a son abiding in the house for ever.

When he turns his face toward the secular community, he is confronted with a system of relationships which are other than those of divine sonship. Occasionally the two loyalties come into sharp conflict. The militant history of the Church illustrates the impracticability of fusing the two systems of relationships together. The Christian continues to be a member of the secular community, and he seeks to bring into the community something derived from his personal relationship to God through Christ, and from his personal relations with his fellow-Christians.

It is this something that appears to me to hold the secret of the Christian community. I venture to suggest that we must distinguish between a *community*, which is any organization of *people* for any purpose whatsoever, and *communitas*, which is a quality of relatedness to common purpose and intention. This κοινωνία is a spiritual quality in people, not the people themselves. And perhaps the greatest responsibility confronting the Christian is the task of spreading throughout the secular community that κοινωνία described in the famous words:—

> That which we have seen and heard . . . declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. If we walk in the light as He is in the light we have fellowship one with another.

COMMUNITY AND POLITICAL THEORY.

By Prof. H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D.

I.

From the standpoint of social philosophy man is a rational self only within a community of selves and by virtue of its endowment. With Ginsberg we may define community as "a collection of human beings occupying a given territory, and held together by a system of common rules"[1], and with Giddings we may postulate as its psychological basis "a consciousness of kind"[2]. The interests, desires, and purposes we share with others do more than establish community—they discover to us our own selves. Personality is essentially social, and the self-regarding instincts are no more fundamental to our lives than the other-regarding. At this time of day so much can be taken for granted. Human communities are not artificial constructions but natural facts, and the individual

[1] *Sociology*, 129. [2] *Principles of Sociology*, 17.

man not an ingredient so much as a product of society. Atomistic individualism is now an exploded theory, and danger no longer threatens from that quarter. It has been replaced by what we may call organic collectivism, and it is with this view of human society that this paper is mainly concerned.

Atomistic individualism failed because it tried to represent society mechanistically as a system of forces. Its individuals who entered into relations through the "Social Contract" were not real human selves, nor were the relations truly personal. At most they were *legal*, and in legal relationships the legal *person* replaces the ethical *personality*. Moreover, in common with all other mechanistic schemes, atomistic individualism had to postulate homogeneous individual centres—and this is why the motive of self-interest becomes the dominating conception. Human self-interest, operative in a multitude of distinct and autonomous selves, is at once the reason why the social contract is necessary, the source of the apprehension of its necessity, and the power that maintains it. But within the social contract and the rules of the game self-interest is accorded the greatest possible scope—(liberty), among men who are homogeneous centres of self-interest—(equality), and who learn to respect and adjust themselves to the self-interest of their neighbours—(fraternity). Atomistic individualism, with its offshoots—*laissez-faire* economics and political romanticism—has been sufficiently belaboured in our time. All we need do now is to notice that its real defect is its attempt to interpret human society by means of categories that are manifestly inadequate to the task. Community may be a natural fact, but at least it is a fact of *human* nature. Small wonder that the fact is distorted when it is forced into a mechanistic scheme borrowed from physical science.

But what of organic collectivism? Is the category of *organism* which has replaced that of a *system of forces* finally satisfactory? That it represents an improvement and approximates more nearly to the truth of the matter is obvious. Human community resembles an organism far more closely than it does a system of forces, and the organic analogy is in many ways a useful one. Nevertheless human communities are *not* organisms, but only *like* organisms in certain respects. In the last resort a human community is neither a system of forces nor an organism, but—a human community. Being a fact of human nature it belongs to a region where purely organic categories have been left behind. It is easy to see the temptation that assails the tidy mind of the sociologist and prompts him to convert an analogy into an identity. And no harm is done so long as the sociologist sticks to his analytical and descriptive last and does not set up in business on his own account as a philosopher. A scientist has a right to any categories and hypotheses he finds useful; only he must not complain when the philosopher criticizes those categories from the point of view of an apprehension of the facts which takes them in fuller concreteness. And where human nature is in question, the last word does not rest even with the philosopher, but with the Christian gospel. What community is and how the individual is related to it cannot be fully known apart from that revelation of the essential being of man which is given in and through the Christian revelation of God. No interpretation of the relation of the individual to the community which sees the former as a mere cog in the social machine or a cell in the social organism can satisfy the requirements of a Christian philosophy of society. Such an interpretation is legitimate only as the provisional hypothesis of a very young science, and we must protest whenever it is regarded as the final truth. As Christians we can never agree that the entire significance of

the individual man is comprehended in his status and function within any earthly community. This would be the case only if the horizons of human consciousness and aspiration coincided with those of human society empirically regarded—that is to say, only if the definition of man as a political animal were really adequate. But if man is born to know God and worship Him, he is in essence more and other than that "human nature" which is the sociological datum. And if it be really true that God calls the individual to an eternal destiny of sonship, then man at once acquires a significance of which secular philosophy can know nothing and which utterly transforms the perspectives of organic collectivism. No doubt atomistic individualism failed to do justice to the concrete realities of social personality. But its successor fails in the same way and for the same reason.

Such interpretations do not come in view of the uniqueness of that social relationship in which human personality has its being. It is true that community is not the creation of independent individuals, but then it is also true that personalities are not simply the creations of community. Man's life is lived in more dimensions than sociology knows, and is constituted by relationships too deep and delicate for State regulation. As an immortal soul he is more permanent than the State or any earthly community, and possesses—as these do not—intrinsic value for God. Even if we allow ourselves to speak of the individual man as a social product, let us remember that he is not a resultant but an *emergent*—a new creation. There is in him what cannot be explained in terms of biological or racial inheritance, psychological constitution, or social environment. He is no mere member of a group, or cell in an organism, or point of intersection of social relationships, or economic "spare-part." He is a child of God, and by God's grace unique, irreplaceable, and immortal.

Organic collectivism is not only a theory of scientific sociology; it passes over into the political field and becomes one element in that complex historical and psychological situation which issues in current totalitarian conceptions of the Nation-State. It is in this political setting that we must now examine it—in the context, that is to say, of the nature and function of the State as a specific organization of the communal life.

The community and the State are not identical. The community with which we are most closely concerned is the nation. Geographical propinquity, blood relationship, a common language, and a common cultural tradition are marks of nationhood rather than its indispensable conditions. Outside totalitarian States it would be generally admitted that nationality is a fluid conception and that none of these marks—with one possible exception—is a *sine qua non*. World-Jewry is a nation in spite of geographical dispersion; the Swiss are a nation in spite of the absence of a common language. The exception is perhaps the common cultural tradition, which is the national analogue of individual memory, the mark of self-identity. Out of this tradition springs the consciousness of a common destiny. Now, though it would be arbitrary to deny nationhood to a national community, *e.g.*, to the Welsh people, on the ground that it is not a State, it may be conceded that history shows that a people's consciousness of a common tradition and a common destiny does tend to create for itself a political organ of self-determination. The Nation-State thus represents a stage in the development of human communities. It is another question whether it represents the final stage. But as things are, the existence of the modern Nation-State presents perhaps the greatest of all problems to a Christian doctrine of community. For the Nation-State refuses to regard itself as a transitional stage on the way to higher forms of com-

munity and by what appears to be a tendency inherent in its nature absolutizes itself as the crown of human development.

The State is an association of the community for the attainment of certain universally accepted ends. Thus the community is logically prior to the State: this is one part of the truth enshrined in the doctrine of the Social Contract. In primitive communities, and even in the City-States of the ancient world, what we call the "State" is only one aspect of the communal life, distinguishable but inseparable from other aspects—religious, cultural, and economic. But none the less the State is the expression of purposes common to all members of the community. This is the second element of truth in the Social Contract theory—that the State derives its authority from *consent*. The development of the State as a specialized organ of community runs parallel to other specializations in religion, art, and economic life, but the State never ceases to be (1) a universal association and (2) one association among others. That it is a universal association, existing in order to secure those ends, which, in Mazzini's words, "affect men equally and in the same way", means that there can be no question of separating the State from the community and setting it up as an independent entity. That it is only one association among others means that communal life pursues other ends than those the State exists to serve, and that therefore the State is never identical with the community in the full concrete richness of its corporate life.

What are the ends for which the State exists? What are those purposes which are so universal as to provide the basis of an association as wide as the community itself? The answer is not difficult: all the citizens are concerned to secure the reign of law and order within the community and to preserve its life against external attack. Thus the State is

> an association which, acting through law as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order[3].

The state thus combines the two heterogeneous elements of Right and Power. It is this paradoxical character of the State that creates the problem for Christian ethics. There is no State where there is no coercive power; but equally there is no State where that power is not used to establish law and order. As Dr. Ernest Barker puts it, the State uses force to create freedom.

At this point we shall be reminded that we have given a minimal definition of the ends of the State which no longer corresponds—if it ever did correspond—to the actualities of history. We shall also be told that to conceive the function of the State as that of mere police regulation is to overlook its supreme ethical duty to promote the good life. Let it be granted, then, that the State exists not only that men may live in peace and harmony with each other, but that they may achieve the "good life". But what is the "good life"? Our view of the functions the State ought to fulfil is necessarily determined by our conception of what the good life really means; and we may add that it ought to be determined by a consideration of the inevitable limitations which circumscribe the useful activity of the State as a promoter of ethical goodness. Force, after all, cannot establish true freedom: at most it can only create external conditions favourable to its emergence. But at any rate it is true that modern Nation-States undertake functions which go far beyond the maintenance of internal order and the defence of the national frontiers. It is

3 Maciver, *The Modern State*, 22.

a commonplace that the last hundred years have witnessed an enormous expansion of State activity in all directions. In Britain the silent revolution—for it is no less—has not been the product of new theories of the State, although these have duly appeared to justify it, but rather of a set of circumstances among which the newly awakened political consciousness of the masses holds an important place. The legislative action of a democratic State is a powerful weapon, and social reformers very naturally have made full use of it to attain their immediate objectives, without concerning themselves overmuch with the problems of long-term strategy. Dicey takes 1870—the year of W. E. Forster's Education Act—as marking the point at which the individualism of political and economic *laissez-faire* begins to yield to collectivism. In one department after another the State is compelled to "interfere" until it ceases to be a mere policeman or referee and becomes the universal provider and omnipresent regulator of men's lives. The significance of the change has been masked by the fact that it was accomplished by the widening of the franchise and the rise to power of the working classes. And no doubt it may be maintained with considerable force that if *law* means justice, and *order* social harmony, the State has not really departed from the *rôle* assigned to it by individualistic theory. If freedom and equality are to be real, then the State must step in to ensure fair bargaining and to redress glaring economic injustice. We do not question the general truth of this proposition, and the reservations that have to be made concern details of method rather than the ground principle that the State must stand for justice to all sections of the community. For whatever the good life may be, it is founded upon material well-being and buttressed by justice and equity. In economic matters one would say that communal control has not gone nearly far enough. But communal control does not necessarily mean State control as the nineteenth century understood it; and we may agree that a drastic overhaul of our representative institutions is essential if they are not to collapse under a burden they were never designed to carry. At the same time the danger in the continual expansion of the State lies very much deeper than those bureaucratic tendencies against which we have been warned by Lord Hewart and Prof. Ramsay Muir. Bureaucracy represents the menace of a hard political rationalism. But however inimical this may be to the higher values of communal living, it pales before the evils which threaten us from the side of the new totalitarian philosophies. For these represent a political irrationalism of the most deadly kind. They are not mere vagaries; like other political philosophies, they reflect actual tendencies and are rooted in the very essence of the State, in that element of it which is sheerly natural, unethical, and irrational—the element of *power*. Perhaps there is no way of banishing this element from the State; but if civilization is not to be destroyed, the irrational power-element in the State must be kept in strict subordination to the rational element of right. In Italian Fascism and German National Socialism the rational element is subordinated to the irrational, justice is the slave of national self-assertion, the State becomes the moral absolute, and its safety the supreme law.

II.

This political naturalism represents the sinister side of the unprecedented expansion of State activity which our age is witnessing. Neither Italian Fascism nor German National Socialism is in strictness a philosophy of State absolutism. Both of them wear their Hegel with a difference. As Polanyi points out, the rationalism of Hegel's conception of the State as Objective Mind comes into conflict with the anti-rationalism

of a vitalistic and racial mysticism, and the victory of the latter is signalized by an inversion of Hegel as noteworthy as that effected by Karl Marx. The Hegelian State is after all the embodiment of rational purposes, and its unlimited authority is grounded on its rationality. But in the new versions of this doctrine the rationalism is submerged. Without losing one iota of its practical predominance, the State ceases to be the incarnation of Reason and becomes the organ of a naked biological urge. The moral, being subordinated to the biological, ceases to be moral, and the rational is narrowly specialized in the service of technological efficiency. Reason goes in blinkers, and truth and justice are no longer transcendent values to be reverenced though the heavens fall, but mere acolytes in the temple of blood and race. Hegelian State-worship was idolatrous, but at least its idol was the principle of rationality. In current race-mysticism the idol shrinks to a fetish, and man turns aside from the claims of rationality to worship a life-force, and escapes from the burden of his moral task by returning to the twilight of his origins and the fierce ecstasies of primeval instincts. We commend to the Freudians a close study of these totalitarian cults. They represent the last refuge of secular humanism and philosophical naturalism in all their forms—the nature-mysticism of pure feeling, the retreat to the levels of irrationalism. "Thus pseudo-mysticism", writes Polanyi[4],

> meets perfectly the requirements of a curiously circumspect irrationalism which combines extreme rationality in the relations of man to nature with a complete lack of rationality in the relations of man to man.

In so far as the State is the incarnation of rational purposes, State-idolatry is not an easy worship. Idolatry is the projection of the worshipper's retreat from reason and the claims of the moral consciousness, and the rational element in the idea of the State tends to inhibit rapture. The more irrational the idol, the more emotionally satisfying the idolatry; and in this respect blood and race have an obvious advantage over the State.

At the same time, we shall miss the point unless we realize how closely political naturalism and racial mysticism are related to that irrational power-element which is as characteristic of the State as the element of rationality and law. The transformation of State-absolutism into racial mysticism is not a violent and arbitrary distortion. The power-element, the totalitarian tendency, present in the empirical State, positively requires such a transformation, and the roots of this necessity lie deep in the contemporary international situation. The Nation-State as we know it, be it democratic, fascist, or communist in complexion, is in its very essence totalitarian. In a democratic State the totalitarian claim is latent; in the fascist State and in the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat it is manifest—that is the difference and the only difference. If this be to anyone a hard saying, he may be invited to consider what happens to a democracy once war is declared. Superficially the democracy remains a democracy. Indeed, if the mark of democracy is popular sovereignty, a democratic State is never more democratic than when the drums sound to arms. Think of 1914. We must not be misled by the emergency measures which curtail or suspend normal individual liberties. The terrible significance of D.O.R.A. is not that it suspended *Habeas Corpus* but that the hearty consent of the community was behind the suspension. When the very life of the nation is in jeopardy, State and community almost coalesce. Far more plausibly than the governments of peace time,

[4] *Christianity and the Social Revolution*, 384.

war governments can claim to be the interpreters and agents of the general will; and the more democratic the constitution the stronger the presumption that this claim is justified. But in the deeper sense there is no room in the same world for democracy and war. In a world organized for war, totalitarianism becomes a necessity. We can have war and preparations for war or we can have true democracy; but we cannot have both. The Communist who regards war as a peculiarly capitalist institution is deceiving himself. No doubt economic imperialism is a factor in the world situation, but it is not the only, nor perhaps the most potent, factor. It may also be true that the supposed economic gains from war are illusory and economic imperialism a veritable mare's nest of fallacies. The fact remains that neither Communist utopianism nor economic rationalism has much chance of prevailing against those blind, unreasoning, collective psychoses that are the real driving force of war. Marxists cannot see that those self-same instincts that range exploiters against exploited in the class-struggle operate infinitely more powerfully, swiftly, and decisively in the conflict of nations, and that the patriotism of the plain man is a world-shaking force which the wicked capitalist could not have created, however deftly he may exploit it. No; when war breaks out, and even when it only threatens, the social harmony of rational consent and constructive criticism which is essential both to true democracy and international co-operation tends to be supplanted by a very different kind of harmony—the horrible unanimity of the terrified herd.

So far we have been speaking of Fascism and Fascist dictatorships; what of the dictatorship of the proletariate? For Marxist Communism, the State is simply an organ of class coercion. In the classless society the State as such will have "withered away" and the administration of things will replace the domination of men. The utter destruction of the Capitalist State is the first condition of the proletarian revolution, the second is the creation of a new kind of State—the dictatorship of the proletariate. The new dictatorship will in one respect resemble the fallen bourgeois State—it will be an instrument of class coercion. In another respect it will differ from it. Unlike the bourgeois State, the dictatorship of the proletariate wields the weapons of coercion not to perpetuate the economic dominance of the workers, but to usher in the day when all classes will disappear in the true communistic society. Thus the dictatorship of the proletariate is consciously planning its own demise, and the Communist commissars are unselfishly labouring to bring near the day when they will lay down their power and retire into obscurity! It is hard to resist the thought that Marxist psychology is singularly naïve in supposing that man's lust for power will disappear with the disappearance of private ownership of the means of production. One fears that sin is too strongly entrenched in human nature to be dislodged by any kind of economic revolution. This utopianism rests on an analysis of the human situation that is far too superficial. As in the case of his view of war, the Marxist is putting the cart before the horse. Undoubtedly private property in the means of economic production places a formidable weapon in the hands of human egoists; but private property did not create that egoism. What men lust after is not profits but power. Take away the profits and they will still seek the power. The Marxist fails to convince us that his dictatorship of the proletariate is essentially different from that of the Fascists, or that his Communist commissars and their party henchmen are so utterly unselfish and undefiled as to need no watching. But the fundamental criticism of the Marxist's view is that, like his view of war, it ignores the enormous strength of the herd-passions of nationalism.

As soon as Communist Russia is seriously menaced by Fascist neighbours, it will be forced in self-defence to become totalitarian in spirit as it already is in policy. It will not be able to neglect the immense reservoir of fighting strength which can be drawn upon by the appeal of blood and race. It is only too probable that Spengler was right and that what our civilization is heading towards is not universal Communism but Caesarism.

Totalitarian philosophy makes a human community the moral absolute. It is in fact the philosophy of "self-expression" on the grand scale, and the defence of the totalitarian ideal follows the same general pattern as the "defence of sensuality". League of Nations and treaty obligations that hamper the achievement of racial destiny are scoffed at or denounced in the same terms as those moral and social conventions which thwart the self-fulfilment of the individual man. In both cases we may see the logical and inevitable development of secular humanism which, deliberately turning its back on God and the supernatural, must sooner or later give up as insoluble the problem of the human individual and the human community. For the solution it proposes is no solution. We are invited to come to terms with our existence by a retreat from thought to feeling, from the life of moral tasks to the life of instincts. Human personality is to be integrated on the lower level of its natural origins, where it ceases to be personality.

Organic collectivism will not necessarily disappear with the disappearance of the absolute sovereignty of the Nation-State. Let us imagine a world where national sovereignties have been surrendered to a world-State and an international police-force has replaced the present huge armaments of the rival powers. In that world, war as we know it might no longer exist. Yet even in the absence of war, totalitarianism might flourish exceedingly—as the Christian Churches would discover were the world-State of Mr. H. G. Wells ever to be realized. For although at present organic collectivism battens on international fears and jealousies, it will not die for want of nutriment if these are ever banished. One day nations may give up the bad habit of going to war with each other; but a change of habit is not invariably the token of a change of heart, and there are other and more potent ways of blasting humanity than with bombs. The totalitarianism of a world-State would create a desolation and call it peace. It may be more rational to worship humanity than to worship Italy or the Nordic stock, but it is equally sinful. The human race is no more fit to ascend God's throne than the German or the Anglo-Saxon. Therefore while it is unquestionably the duty of the Christian to labour for a warless world, let him never forget that a warless world may still be a world alienated from God. The "Brave New World" of Aldous Huxley's satire is no mere fantasy but a terrifying possibility. When science has solved for all the problem of economic security, and material comforts abound; when life is healthier and safer and death very remote; when all moral superstitions are banished, all taboos lifted, and contraceptives as cheap and commonplace as cigarettes—then man will come into his kingdom, and God will be dead.

But suppose man be dead too? For is *he* a man—this creature of conditioned reflexes, this cog in the machine, this tiny, spoon-fed, purblind denizen of the stud-farm and the hive? And is this monstrous mechanism a community? Man's kingdom is God's gift—and this the totalitarian and collectivist philosophies of our day ignore or deny. For they are in the last resort manifestations of that mysterious human act we call *sin*—man's *claim* to be autonomous—his desperate attempt to be sufficient unto himself and to do without God.

Thus behind humanism lurks paganism, whose god is no longer man but Pan. Sensualistic individualism and organic collectivism are both manifestations of what Nietzsche called the dionysian element in human life, and our secular civilization oscillates between them. The temporary ascendancy of the one paves the way for the dominance of the other. The lawlessness of the morally "emancipated", itself a revolt against the deadening blight of a materialistic civilization, makes dictatorship necessary and even welcome to a cynical disillusionment that hankers after external authority. But alike in his eager submission to authority and in his revolt against it, modern man is still his egoistic, God-denying self. For the authority he craves is one which will relieve him of allegiance to the only authority that can confer the freedom of moral selfhood. It is easier to surrender to herd emotions than to listen to the voice of conscience. It is more comfortable to be lost in the crowd than to stand naked and alone in the presence of the living God. Nor is any kind of synthesis possible; for on the foundations of egoism no doctrine of community can be constructed. Individualism and collectivism confront one another as irreconcilable foes. "Natural right" can be pleaded on both sides, but in the context of egoism natural right is a contradiction in terms. My natural right to self-indulgence, like the community's natural right to self-preservation, is not a "right" at all, but a mere power. Here might is right, and the struggle between individual and collective egoism is endless, since neither side is willing to submit to the judgments of a higher court. For neither the individual nor the community can legitimately appeal to rights except under the acknowledgment that in human affairs right and not nature must be paramount. And if right is paramount, then both the individual and the community lie under moral obligation. Until this acknowledgment is made, the individual is merely a centre of instinctive forces and the community a sub-human herd.

III.

For the Christian mind, the problem of the State is part of the problem of human community as such, and can be seen in the right perspective only within that wider context. That is why it seemed worth while to show how modern forms of State absolutism have their roots in a false philosophy of human community. But the more specific question of the Christian attitude to the State still awaits us, and in the light of the foregoing discussion certain broad principles may be briefly set down.

If we have stressed the dionysian power-element in the State, that must not be taken to imply that we overlook the element of right and law, which gives the State its indefeasible title to our reverence and allegiance. Christian thought can no more repudiate the State than it can concede its absolutist claims. As a repository and guardian of law the State possesses a Divine commission, and, within the limits of this commission, a Divine authority. Beyond these limits, however, its authority is to be resisted. Now since the State continually tends to transgress these limits, it reveals itself as demonic as well as divine. It is both God's servant and God's enemy. It is both the Divine discipline for sinful men, and itself the clearest manifestation of that human egoism which is the essence of sin. Hence Christian ethical thought in its main line has been a prolonged attempt to discover a *via media* between anarchy and State-worship. We can neither refuse obedience to the State nor make our obedience absolute. We concede to the State a relative right, but both the adjective and the noun are of vital importance. The "right" means that it is only with the greatest reluctance and in the very last resort that the Christian will refuse

the State's demands; for apart from the State's authority human society would sink into chaos. Better a few bad laws than lawlessness. But that the right is "relative" means that the Christian is not prepared to say that the risk of lawlessness is so great as to override all other considerations. For example, whether we are absolutists in our Christian pacifism or not, we should regard it as our Christian duty to protest against an "unrighteous" war. But so long as a system of collective security does not exist, so long as States remain truly sovereign, the right of the Christian to protest against *any* war is one that the State will not and indeed cannot concede. When war breaks out questions of "righteousness" become irrelevant, or rather the safety of the community becomes the supreme moral law, binding upon all its members. Can the Christian admit this position? Once again, it is not a question whether the Christian has the right to declare that in no circumstances will he take part in war. The question is whether the State, so long as it is sovereign, can allow him the *right* to be a pacifist in *any* circumstances. The war issue, once more, brings to light the essential totalitarianism of the sovereign State as such.

The doctrine of the omnicompetent State has been evolved by lawyers, and although we owe a great debt to the jurists who have laboured in the field of political theory, the predominantly legal character of their arguments has sometimes led to a certain abstractness and remoteness from actualities. The "omnicompetent State" is in fact a purely legal conception. It means that since the State is the source of all positive law, it is itself above law, and that therefore nothing it may decide or do can be *illegal*. Miracles apart—and clearly there is no sense in saying that the State may change the order of the seasons—there is nothing the State may *not* do. But what the State *can* do is very strictly limited by the actual situation and the peculiar character of its own activity, and what it *ought* to do or to attempt to do is still further limited—at any rate from our Christian point of view—by the Word of God. Christian political realism cannot deny that the coercive power of the State is both right and necessary, but it will also insist upon the inescapable limits within which this coercion is exercised. So far is State activity from being identical with the communal life in its full concreteness, that the latter, with its myriad centres of thought and action, its voluntary associations, and the infinite variety of relationships and groupings of its members, is necessarily the abiding presupposition not only of the State's regulative functions, but of its very existence. This, of course, is the contention of the political pluralists, who point out that a legal enactment is only the last stage in the process of law-making, merely registering and confirming what public opinion has already determined; that a charter of incorporation does not really create the legal "person" but merely recognizes an existing fact; and that other associations besides the State have their place and right—some, like the family and religious society, being coeval with the State or even prior to it. Unfortunately all this may be ignored, and the State may try to make its legal omnicompetence a factual absolutism. Now modern science makes despotism easier by equipping the State with more formidable weapons than those of physical coercion. The control of the press and the radio is worth more than a dozen army corps to an astute dictator. From the highest human standpoint the short-term success of the totalitarian State is dearly bought—but in the meantime its technical efficiency is undeniable. This is why the secular arguments of political pluralism are of little use by themselves. The ultimate question for us as Christians is not what the State may do or can do, but what it *ought* to

do. And the question what the State ought to do cannot be answered except from the standpoint of a philosophy of the Good Life.

As a matter of fact, State activity is always the expression of a philosophy of the Good Life. This is just as true of the dwarfed and bridled State of *laissez-faire* as of the totalitarian States of our time. No doubt the philosophy has often been implicit and unconscious, but it has always been there—and an unrealized philosophy is apt to be a bad one. The touchstone of all such philosophies is John Smith—the average man. There is a certain type of mind that is prone to think how much easier and efficient government would be if men could be geared into each other as parts of a vast machine. And if technical efficiency is the supreme goal of statecraft, the individuality of John Smith is as much a nuisance and a menace as a wrongly-cut gear or a wobbly fly-wheel. Cogs and pistons must not be individual and have no right to freedom. By all means let us make John Smith efficient. But efficient *for what?* Why must we give him decent conditions of labour, economic security, education, leisure, culture, ethical ideas, and the consolations of religion? To make him a satisfactory agent of economic production? Or a good soldier? Or a docile servant of the State? No doubt Smith is a problem. His moral and intellectual inertia is the despair of his pastors and masters. His individuality must be restrained, yet respected; curbed, yet not crushed. At the moment he is ill at ease with freedom and longs to hand over to the experts the ordering of his life. Yet by his obedience to despotic authority he is evading his destiny just as surely as by the anarchic self-assertiveness of his earlier mood. He does not want to grow up, and so he welcomes philosophies which offer him release from the protracted and painful tensions of moral freedom. Let us keep him in mind in our discussions, for apart from what we have to bring him from the infinite resources of the Christian Gospel, John Smith is of all men most miserable.

That Gospel, in revealing the nature of God, reveals also the real nature of John Smith, and in the Christian conception of personality we have a means of transcending the dreary conflict of individual and collective egoisms. Neither the individual of *laissez-faire* nor the social group of modern collectivism is a personality in the Christian sense of the word. In fact a purely secular sociology never comes within sight of the true problem of human community. We have noted a tendency to falsify the specifically human data through the employment of merely mechanistic or biological categories. But as soon as the attempt is made to transcend the purely scientific standpoint, the problem of community ceases to be one of interpretation of sociological data and becomes *an ethical task* confronting us all. For here we encounter community *as it is* standing under the judgment of God's Word and of community *as it ought to be.* For on the Christian view of them, neither personality nor community is a natural fact, a mere datum, but the creation of God. The empirical individual is born into the empirical community, and both are, so far forth, natural facts which sociology may describe and social philosophy interpret. But the description remains a mere description of certain aspects of human nature, and the interpretation is inadequate and even false so long as it is not recognized that man has a supra-mundane destiny. Over against empirical man, the social animal, stands the new man in Christ Jesus, and over against the empirical community, the great Leviathan, stands the Kingdom of God. Man, it appears, is not to be fully understood either as ingredient or product of empirical community, nor is his significance to be measured by his status and function therein. From this new standpoint, the individual man, being called by God to an eternal destiny, has

a value which outweighs that of all empires, civilizations, and economic systems, and a reality which transcends that of all empirical communities. For he is *man,* upon whom the Holy One has set His love. By grace of his Divine calling, all things are for him that he may be for God, the brotherhood, and all mankind. He is a citizen of heaven.

Yet he remains a citizen of the world as well, and his realistic acceptance of the conditions of life within the empirical community is a part of his obedience to God. Thus the tension between the sinful world and the Kingdom of God remains as the abiding presupposition of our Christian thinking and practice. In spite of its demonic aspect, the State is still to be regarded as God's minister, and although the claims of earthly society may often clash with the claims of Christ, they do not admit of wholesale rejection as being extraneous to the Christian life. In spite of its sin, the world is still God's world and the sphere in which our service to Him must be discharged. To believe in a Kingdom of God fully realizable in an earthly community is to believe in something which is not God's Kingdom. But to refuse the task of creating social justice and moulding social institutions a little nearer in accord with the mind of Christ is an evasion of our plain Christian duty. No doubt the tension between the world and the Kingdom will remain to the end, but that does not excuse us in despairing of a new and better social international order any more than in pretending that the tension does not exist.

This tension is at its acutest in the fact of the State. Even in its divine aspect as the founder and guardian of the social order and the instrument for securing the well-being of its citizens the State is still equipped with *force.* Considered in themselves, coercion and love are ethical contraries, and yet coercion may be used in love's service. Although he knows a more excellent way, the Christian cannot deny to the State its weapon of coercion. But the weapon is a dangerous one and its efficacy is limited. It is mainly our preoccupation with the problem of war that leads us to give less attention than they deserve to the serious issues involved in the use of the most potent of all forms of coercion—psychological suggestion. From the Christian point of view, to put a man's critical faculty to sleep and to drug his conscience may be a worse crime against his personality than to load his limbs with fetters. The vast resources of psychological coercion now at the disposal of the State constitute an ever-present peril to which Christians dare not be blind. Nevertheless, coercion, whether physical or psychological, is justified in so far as it serves and does not thwart the purposes of redemptive love. But the limitations of coercion lie in its very nature as a force that operates upon a man from the outside. A force cannot redeem, even though it may be an essential condition of redemption. As Reckitt says[5]:—

> The very fact that the State has a monopoly of the machinery of armed force—as it must have—makes it ordinarily not the best but the worst instrument for moral and even educational purposes.

The penalty imposed on the criminal must be recognized by him as just, *i.e.,* as sheer penalty, before it can become a reformatory discipline. But it is not the penalty as such that can win this recognition from him, nor the whole apparatus of State sovereignty, but a power of a very different kind with which the State may ally itself, but which it can neither absorb nor control. State action, being in the last resort coercive, is fitted for regulative and co-ordinating functions, but unfitted to provide the spontaneity and free initiative of thought and practice which are the very life

5 *Christian Sociology,* 73.

of human society and the spring of moral progress. In Dr. Temple's words[6]:—

> The State is the pre-condition of the maintenance of all common or social life. But it is only the pre-condition. The higher values of that life are established upon the foundations it provides, but are themselves beyond its cognizance. If the State in its general co-ordination of the common life seriously restricts in freedom of action one of the associations specially concerned with any of those higher values, that association may be bound *in duty to the community* to resist the State; for in such a case the State is impoverishing the common life which it exists to preserve and foster.

There is no time left to deal with the many pressing problems of Christian political strategy, and a word or two must suffice. Let us remember that Christians are a minority within the State, and that the minority tactics of permeation and persuasiveness are dictated to us as much by the necessities of the situation as by our loyalty to the Christian law of Love. In regard to the State that means, surely, that, recognizing that the philosophy which inspires State activity is at best something less than Christian, we shall maintain our distinctively Christian witness while not refusing our whole-hearted co-operation in the tasks of social justice. For while perfect justice is unattainable apart from perfect love, there is a relative justice which as an ethical ideal is entrenched in the very life of community and finds partial expression in the State and its laws. In other words, although we must never slacken in our task of creating in John Smith and his like a Christian conscience, we must remember that, even as unregenerate, Smith has a conscience which knows however dimly the meaning of justice, and is not insensible to the appeal for a better social and economic order. We must co-operate with Smith to secure the external conditions of that order, but without forgetting that more than a change of institutions and systems is needed if even relative justice is to be made fully real in human society. As Christians—and particularly as Congregationalists—we are committed to a two-fold task. On the one hand, as members of the Christian fellowship we are pledged to the preaching of the Gospel of Redemption and to obedience to the Law of Love. The Christian idealism that seeks the immediate realization of the perfect community has been transmitted to us Congregationalists through our Anabaptist heritage. Even though absolute withdrawal from secular society is no longer possible, we are still called to make experiments in Christian fellowship wherein the *Koinonia* shall be a concrete society with economic aspects and implications. But the idealism of the Anabaptists must be married to the realism that is the note of our inheritance from Calvin. The very impossibility of contracting out of our secular citizenship—that manifest obstacle to perfect fellowship—is turned into an opportunity when we recognize that secular citizenship is also our Divine vocation, and that we are commanded to order and use its institutions to the glory of God. Experiments in Christian fellowship "without tarrying for any" and the reform of secular institutions through the channels of our civic influence and responsibilities are thus no longer mutually exclusive alternatives, but complementary methods of Christian witness. It is not a question of "either . . . or" but of "both . . . and".

In order that we may discharge our two-fold commission, we demand of the State, in the first place, that it shall concede and maintain freedom of opinion and propaganda, and, secondly, that it shall not transgress

6 *Christianity and the State*, 126.

those limits beyond which its coercive activities no longer further but obstruct the development of moral personality. But no sooner have we stated our demands than we realize that the State, as we know it, can never concede them as of absolute right and validity. Even if we presuppose a democratic political order as most favourable to the growth of ethical selves and the furtherance of social justice, the points of possible collision between Christianity and secular social philosophy are still present. So long as the power-element in the State tends to encroach upon and occlude the element of right—that is, so long as the State as we know it exists—the tension between Christ and Cæsar, between the Kingdom and the empirical community, remains. And so long as the world is alienated from its Lord, is there in the day of crisis any other resource left to a Church that would be faithful to its trust but to take up the Cross and to deny to Cæsar the things that belong to God?

THE PRESENT CHALLENGE.

NOTES OF AN ADDRESS BY Dr. J. H. Oldham.

The challenge fundamentally is whether it is possible to create a centre in the world which would prove a rallying point for forces which will provide an effective resistance to those mighty movements now dominating large parts of the world. Can there come to birth a living faith which will be felt by the majority of men to be more relevant to the pressing problems of to-day than the current presentation of Christianity by the Churches is felt to be?

It is true to say that both the Church and the world to-day are passing through a crisis. Ideas are governing many peoples—Communism and National Socialism—which are living faiths in the sense that they represent passionate convictions, sincerely held, about the ultimate meaning of life. The question is whether out of the resources of the Christian faith there will arise a body of convictions which an increasing number of people will accept as a satisfying alternative, a faith which will be accepted by the laity as something by which they can live in the modern world.

If "Faith and Order" is primarily for ministers, "Life and Work" is primarily for the laity. By concentrated effort of thought and by the venture of faith can a scheme of life be reached on which the laity can act with as complete devotion as men accept Communism and Fascism?

It must be recognized that for large bodies of men to-day—the working-class, the intelligentsia, the Universities—the central affirmations of the Christian faith have ceased to be significant. The work of our Universities is carried on to-day for the most part as if the Christian affirmations need not be considered, and much of our modern life entirely ignores the assertions of the Christian faith about the meaning of the universe.

This fact is often concealed from us because in the activities of the Church we are in touch with large numbers of people still within the Christian tradition, and in serving them we lose sight of this larger world where Christian ideas are ignored. For a large part of the world all that we stand for has no meaning at all. As a brilliant research student said to me, "For *all* the people with whom I associate, including my landlady, the Church means nothing at all". Not only so, but for a considerable body of the laity still within the Church, whose lives are governed by Christian ethical standards, the crucial affirmations of our faith have ceased to be a vital force.

Here then is the challenge. It must be met in 1. Thought, 2. Action.

1. The Challenge to Thought.

If we are to arrive at a new body of Christian convictions, it may perhaps be along a negative path, as we become increasingly clear about the things we must repudiate and deny. This is happening at present, for many thinkers in reaction from new ideologies and new philosophies are finding themselves more Christian than they thought. In the same way as the sloughing off of heresies shaped the Creeds, so it may be the task of the Church to-day, through a growing clarity regarding what as Christians we must repudiate, to arrive at a body of widely accepted convictions which can guide ethical life.

What then are some of these heresies?

(*i*) *Nationalism.* The idea that the State has an absolute authority is in direct conflict with the Christian view. In Italy, Germany, and Japan the conflict is obvious, but it is latent in our own country. It seems almost incredible to those brought up in the atmosphere of liberalism that in our time in countries belonging to what was once known as Christendom, men and women should be facing the risk of martyrdom for the Christian faith. We are back to the state of mind when Emperor worship was demanded, with the Community-State in the place of the Emperor. Between those who are fundamentally convinced that in the ideas back of the absolutist States are the supreme things of life and those who believe in obedience to a higher will the conflict is joined.

(*ii*) There are two opposed heresies, both of which the Church, it seems to me, must equally repudiate. The first is Secularism, with the deification of man which has dominated much of European thought, and now finds its culminating expression in Russia. It leads to forms of Utopianism, the expectation that you can build here in the temporal order the Kingdom of God in which life can find full satisfaction. The Church must likewise oppose any theory which refuses to recognize that the transcendent meaning of life must find expression in the temporal order. The Church must be as concerned to give effect to the meaning of the transcendental in the temporal as the Communists are.

This leads to the question of central importance in the whole field of Christian ethics, which demands more *theological* thinking by the Churches than it has as yet received. Somehow we must secure thinking on a large scale, on questions for which the Churches now make little provision. Emil Brunner's *Das Gebot und die Ordnungen* deals with the tension between the divine absolute command of love and the "orders" or framework of institutions within which human life is set. The central Christian affirmation, as against both nineteenth century anarchic individualism and twentieth century impersonal collectivism, is that the Christian life finds its ultimate meaning in the sphere of the personal, that man has his being *in the Word,* that *God,* by His call to man, gives him responsible selfhood, and a man can only love God as he loves Him in men. Following Brunner, we must ask how the absolute Divine command of love can be applied in the spheres and duties of everyday life. Here the question of pacifism is of great importance because most of the fundamental theological questions emerge in regard to it. We have two bodies of men with opposing passionate religious convictions. The first holds that it is irreconcilable with the Christian understanding of life that the Christian should participate in war. The second holds that the pacifist view, the attempt to apply an absolutist ethic, is wrong, because it is blocking the only path (that of "collective security") along which mankind can advance to the riddance of war.

2. The Challenge to Action.

Action is possible in a number of ways. We mention two:

(*i*) In view of the fact that the central Christian affirmation makes it clear that the meaning of life is found in the sphere of the personal, it follows that the meaning of life cannot be exhausted in intellectual propositions, in which only the mind is concerned. This implies that *preaching* only is not sufficient. The response of the whole being, of the entire man, is sought. We are striving, not merely for clearer intellectual grasp, though that is important, but for a body of experience by people who have entered by self-giving into fuller life. Here the work of the "Oxford" Group, with its challenge for complete surrender, is valuable.

The response to the challenge must be an uprising, an adventure, of Christian people to enter into the meaning of the personal, to be learnt only through self-giving, suffering, the Cross.

(*ii*) The next demand is for new types of ministry, especially to express the Christian faith in the sphere of Brunner's "orders". It is only in *concrete experience,* and not in general principles, that such expression is effective. There is therefore a call for a new and enlarged conception of the ministry, in which the minister might be the centre of a group or groups of people, who, having realized the Christian view of life to be the "master light of all their seeing", are endeavouring to transform the local situation in accordance with the Christian understanding of life. If this could come about under the influence of the Churches, it might mean that those Churches brought about a real rebirth of democracy, just as they were instrumental in bring democracy to birth.

The answer to the challenge of the totalitarian State can only be given in practice, by groups transforming local life. Here then is a function for the Christian minister, in the atmosphere of worship to draw round him groups of the laity who will work this transformation.

In a recent pamphlet, *Die Erneuerung der Kirche,* Brunner points out that the whole of our existing Church administration and machinery has come down almost unchanged from the time when most of the people were within its sphere of influence. The Church has not made the drastic readjustments necessary to meet the new situation when most of the people are altogether outside that sphere. While there are large and growing circles who believe that "the Church is finished", our methods remain, though appropriate for those who remain within, entirely inadequate for those who have completely broken with her.

The Church must therefore face this important question, how to develop machinery to make points of contact with people outside the Churches at points where they are interested, must learn afresh ways of reaching the people.

* * *

The great need, then, is for a Christian "Open Conspiracy". The Oxford Conference on Life and Work can only make an incidental contribution to the solution of the problem, but it may have historic significance if it can forward a Christian Open Conspiracy. Wholly unorganized, with no membership, this will be the coming together of minds thinking together, groups of men in every land, all of whom will be in touch with ever-widening constituencies until they reach the whole body of Christians. There at last will be the effective rallying centre in the name of Christ against the forces which challenge the Church to-day.

THE WAY FORWARD.

By the Rev. B. C. Plowright, B.A., B.D.

In any attempt to see our way forward from the situation in which we at present find ourselves both as churches and as secular communities, we have to hold fast to the integrity of the Christian conviction concerning the basis of Christian action. The Johannine phrase "He that willeth to do His will shall know of the doctrine" represents a deep conviction in the mind of Jesus. An act in faith leads to the discovery of truth. "Act and discover" is a sound motto of Christian life and deed. And equally important it is to remember that the Christian is to serve God with all his mind, and therefore he cannot be absolved from the equally primary duty of thinking out his practical plans and programmes and so of getting a view of the lay-out of the situation as a whole and of discerning the most likely point for a fruitful attack upon it. For Jesus, thought and action are inter-dependent, the inside and the outside of the one fact; thought fructifies action, and action in its turn enriches and deepens insight again by thought.

We have therefore to face a double issue, an issue which on one side of it might almost be described as academic and theoretical, and on the other side is severely practical in its demand for obedience. If I were to sum up abstractly the conclusion of this paper, it would be to the effect that the situation is clear enough to admit of taking the next step, though we can make no kind of calculus of the effects or remoter issues of that step, but that as we take it in humble faith the further steps will become clear. And if that seems to you but a poor mouse for the mountain to bring forth, I can only remind you that that is in fact the way that all renewals of social life and religion have taken place; the remoter steps, especially the remoter means which were to be taken and used to achieve the end, were never clear at the beginning; they only manifested themselves as in response to the vision they had seen, the tiny bit of truth they knew, men were humbly obedient to it.

With this proviso in mind then, that practice and thought go hand in hand and are not to be divorced from each other, and that any splitting up of the main problem into a theoretical and a practical issue is largely for the purpose of clear thinking only, we may turn to our task this morning. Let me say at once that the main issue of principle turns on the relationship between the Christian community—the Church—and secular community, and here in turn the main problem to be solved is as to whether the relationships which have obtained between them since the time of Constantine are the true relationships. The advent of Constantine and the setting up of the Christian religion as the official faith of the State had repercussions which reached far beyond either theology or morals; they affected the whole fabric and texture of the Christian fellowship and gave to it a new conception of its function. It is not too much to say that in one deep and true sense the Church gained the world and lost its soul. What the Constantinian settlement effected can be summed up under four separate heads:

1. It set up the doctrine of the two empires, the two swords, the two areas of life. Clearly there could not be two absolute authorities each claiming to deal with the whole of life. The tacit concordat was therefore arrived at that the political community, the State, would deal with all the material affairs of men, the Church with the spiritual. Thus was effected that great dichotomy of human personality into a spiritual self and a material self, a division from which we have only lately begun to

get free. More, the Church consciously or unconsciously allowed the State to determine the categories in which the relationships between the two were stated. It accepted the definition of the relationship between the two in political terms, *i.e.*, of equality, inferiority, or superiority, and thus was engendered a struggle between the two which infected the Church with absolutism and obscured its true relationship to secular community, *i.e.*, a relationship of redemption.

2. It laid undue emphasis on one side only of the Christian message. Christianity became increasingly a message for the individual which had certain social consequences and issues, and it lost sight of the fact that it is equally a message for community involving stringent demands on the individual.

3. The pre-occupation of the Church with specifically moral and spiritual issues, *i.e.*, with sin, its origin and effects, completed the process begun by Paul. I am not going to join in the fashionable hue-and-cry indulged in by men who have not historic imagination enough to comprehend his situation, nor soul enough to appreciate his greatness, but I am constrained to point out that Paul drops out almost completely one aspect of the message of Jesus, to wit, that anxiety and fear may be as disastrous to spiritual personality as sin. That process of the over-moralization of the Christian message which was begun by Paul was completed in the fourth century. Thereby the attention of the Church and all its propaganda were focused still more sharply in the individual. Had the Church kept Christ's sense of the importance of fear, it could hardly have escaped the plain fact that many fears have their origins in community life, and its message therefore would have been more completely personal and social.

4. The splitting up of personality into spirit and body reached its most disastrous climax in the uncritical acceptance of the assumption that the Christian could express his Christian personality fully within the limits set by secular community. He belonged as fully and as completely to the one as to the other. It is this issue which has mainly to be determined now, for it lies at the back of all our confusion with regard to the urgent practical problems of our Christian attitude to war and the like.

All this makes strange reading when we compare it with the teaching of Jesus. It is clear that for Him the balance between the individual and the community is held even. The burden of His preaching was the Kingdom of God, and in opposition to modern scholars who assert that the Kingdom of God was a purely spiritual creation I would venture to make two comments:

1. That the Jews steadily refused to split personality up into spirit and body. Just as the modern psychologist talks about human personality being mind-body so the Jew thought of it as being spirit-body.

2. Amongst His contemporaries the Kingdom of Heaven did connote an actual community. True, it was the act of God, God in action, but it was the action of God made concrete in a visible society. It is both process and end. At no single point does Jesus attempt to suggest that His contemporaries are wrong, and the mere fact that He nowhere challenges their interpretation suggests that for Him too the Kingdom of God was a visible and actual community.

For Jesus therefore the Christian witness has to do—and with equal primacy—with both the individual and the community. He holds both together, and it is untrue to say that Christianity is a message for the individual more than it is a message concerning community. It is both, and both at one and the same time. Since it is a message for both community and for the individual, it has to do with the whole life of both. It

is difficult to conceive anything further from the mind of Jesus than this sharp separation between individual and community or between spiritual needs and physical.

But it is when we come to examine the teaching of Jesus concerning the relationship between the Christian fellowship and the secular that the sharpest cleavage between His teaching and the post-Constantinian practice appears. Nothing is more patent than that Jesus began by assuming that His own nation would bring in the Kingdom of God, and equally clearly with that, that He saw that the Kingdom could never be ushered in solely by the allegiance of individual disciples, and that beyond that problem of renewing the life of the individual, He saw the further problem of welding those individuals together into a fellowship. The two points become clear if we trace the thought of Jesus on the matter. At the outset He assumed that His own nation, as distinct from the religious leaders of His day, would be the society which would fulfil the conditions for the coming of the Kingdom, but at the close He was explicit and emphatic that that would not be the case. We can hardly over-estimate the solemnity and significance of His phrase in the parable of the wicked husbandmen, "Behold the Kingdom is taken away from you and given to a nation that bringeth forth the fruits of righteousness". If these words mean anything, they represent His final abandonment of the hope that His own nation would make the desired moral response. It is significant in this connexion that after His rejection by the crowd the ministry of Jesus is for the most part concerned with His own disciples. He had already said to them, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom", and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that they, the disciples, were the nation to bring forth the fruits of righteousness. So He takes them apart, and henceforth the burden of His ministry was to establish right relationships first of all between themselves and Him, and secondly between each other. I suggest that at the end Jesus trusted the redemption of the world not merely to the action of individuals going out from the Christian community into the secular to redeem it by their own higher standards and practices, but equally to the evangelical testimony of the quality and temper of the Christian fellowship in and by itself *qua* fellowship. Of the area and scope of life to be covered by that fellowship it is not my purpose here to speak. I will only say that in my judgment our present conception of Christian fellowship as expressing itself solely in religious acts, service, and propaganda is, to put it mildly, a minimum statement of what Jesus intended it to be, and that we probably do not do justice to His conception unless we think of the Christian fellowship as concerned with the bread and butter activities of life as well. But whether that be so or not, what is of importance is the test He set up of Christian community. For Him, the thing by which the true community stood or fell was its effect on personal relationships: in so far as it made true relationships possible it was a truly Christian fellowship; by so much the more it failed both to embody them and create them it was the less a true fellowship. The supreme expression of true personal relationships was to be found in forgiveness, and in forgiveness both received and sought; where an offence had been suffered the individual was to be willing to forgive until seventy times seven; where the offence had been offered men were to go to the last extremity to put the matter right. Not even the duty of worship came before the duty of seeking forgiveness. It was this Christian fellowship, embodying good will at its maximum intensity, which Jesus offered in place of secular community based on force and self-interest and which He deliberately created as the substitute for the latter, and I do not think that we shall get our thinking about the relationship between

the Christian community and the secular straight until we accept quite frankly the conception of the Church, the Christian fellowship, as the supreme expression of community. The Church was to challenge the lower standards of secular community, and challenge them always by the quality of its own life and the rightness of personal relationships within it. And Jesus was explicit that that Christian fellowship would never fit easily into the State or secular community. He never left His disciples in any kind of doubt that the floods of death and hell would be let loose against them, that individual members of the fellowship would be hailed before kings and governors for His name's sake and that every Christian lived in permanent jeopardy of the Cross, *i.e.*, of being visited by the civil power with the official punishment for rebellion. It is precisely this sense of not being wholly involved in the secular community, indeed of being sharply separated from it, which meets us in the Pauline epistles. The burdens of *Romans* is that the Church is the new Israel of God, and we get more than one indication that the Church had its own life and practice which often took it clean out of the secular community. The most obvious illustration is Paul's refusal to acknowledge that any Christian had the right to go to law with a brother Christian before the State tribunal. And if we read a hint in the *Apocalypse* rightly, and the Christians were subject to an economic boycott in certain districts, they must have been almost self-contained economic communities as well. And that condition of separateness from the State maintained itself with greater or less success throughout the first three centuries—more easily so long as the converts were drawn from the dispossessed classes and their thought was dominated by the conception of the speedy Advent of the Lord; less easily as the apocalyptic hope faded and converts began to be attracted from the more cultured and prosperous classes of the community. And so long as that sense of separateness was maintained the Christian witness, *e.g.*, against war, remained relatively steady and unmistakable. The Christians were not of this world and the world could never be in any doubt about it. Their citizenship was in heaven and they had only a limited citizenship on earth. And what Congregationalism represents in essence is the recovery of that sense of the Christian Fellowship as a separated community, which is neither, as with some Anglicans, the secular community on its religious side, nor yet, as with the Roman Catholic, in rivalry *qua* institution with the State for supremacy, but which regards its relationship with the secular community as redemptive.

The limitations of that redemptive relationship inherent in the primitive Congregational conception of the Church as they have actually worked themselves out in practice, I shall deal with at a later stage. What I am concerned with now is to suggest that the answer to the intellectual question—the vital question for our own age—as to whether the *pre-* or the *post*-Constantinian relationships between the Christian fellowship and the secular community more nearly represents the mind of Jesus, is that the former is true, and that we Congregationalists are the especial custodians of it. I would only venture to add one further word of caution, to wit, that our historic pre-occupation in the churches with the relationship of the Church to political community ought not to make us oblivious to the fact that the ends of political community have suffered a sea-change, that they are no longer dynastic or determined by personal ambition, but that increasingly they are appointed by economic interests, which, in so far as they are organized, may be described as an economic community. The domination of politics by economics is the characteristic feature of modern political life, and we have little valid ground for criticism of an established Church which is clearly entangled with political community, *i.e.*, the State,

if we ourselves, less formally and definitely, but none the less firmly, are bound to the existing economic community. Is it any more deadly a sin to draw revenues from an ungodly State than it is to depend for finance on an ungodly economic order? We have to be sharply on our guard lest we allow the discussion of the relationships between the Christian fellowship and secular community to be stated in terms of a historic situation which in fact does not really represent the rich complexity of the situation with which we have to deal.

With the foregoing discussion in our minds, we can now turn to ask what practical issues are involved. And I hold this to be primary—the holding fast to the central and creative idea that political and economic communities, as we know them, in the mind of Jesus are neither the supreme nor the stable expression of community. I say that deliberately because there is a tendency, even amongst Christian theologians who ought to know better, to accept political and economic forms of community as being a true and complete expression of it, and to regard the Church as being the means to serve the ends of the redemption of such community. As over against that we have to reverse the picture and see in the political community the shadow of which the Church is the substance, the imperfect form of community which is only fully realized and adequately expressed in the true Christian fellowship. To put it in terms of biological evolution, with the creation of the Christian fellowship the social evolutionary process took a new turn and carried on the true development of community. Just as in the evolution of mammalian life, there came a point at which the main carrier of the evolutionary process "split off", and in one direction created the ape—a dead end of evolution—and in the other carried the process forward to man, even so is it in the development of community—the political community based on coercion and self-interest is a "dead end" in the development of community and the true line of development is to be found in the Christian fellowship. And if that seems to you strong and strange and revolutionary doctrine, I can only say that it seems to me to represent the true teaching and intention of Jesus, and that nothing is more imperative than that as Christians we hold that firmly in the mind. That recovery of a sense of true churchmanship, and of a clear cut conviction of the function of the Church, is vital, and until we recapture it our thought about the relationship of the Church to other forms of community will be murky and obscure, and our practice dubious and uncertain.

Side by side with that, we must hold to this, that the true relationship of the fellowship with secular community as we know it can only be expressed in the language of redemption. For it is clear that the analogy I have drawn between ape and man, whilst truly indicative of the actual relationship between the secular community and the Christian fellowship, breaks down at one vital point. Community, and the groups within it, are composed of, and ultimately their shape and characteristics are determined by, self-conscious, self-directive, moral individuals, and since this is so, secular community is capable of determining its own moral quality and character. That is to say, it is capable of redemption. The secular community belongs to that order of creation which Paul describes as "waiting for redemption, to wit, the manifestation of the sons of God".

In what ways then can and does the Church exercise its redemptive social influence? Always and in the forefront of its responsibility lies its action upon the individuals who compose the secular community—its specifically evangelical task. Whilst it is not true, as I have earlier suggested, that good men necessarily make a good community *and* that there abides a specific task of technique—the right and effective organization of such knowledge and power as we possess, yet it remains none the less

true that without the Christian individual the Christian community cannot be established. Conversion is not enough, it is true, but it is indispensable, and therefore the evangelical task of bringing men and women under the thraldom of Christ, there to find release from the fears which ride them and the sins which beset them, is an indispensable part of our social redemptive task. It is the foundation on which everything else rests. The true Christianization of the individual is the socialization of the individual. Yet it is foundation and not the whole building, and the Christian task is only begun to be discharged when Christian evangelism—I use the word in a semi-technical sense—has been given its due and right place in the activities of the Church. Christianity is not concerned to make men good in general, but good in a particular kind of way, and, put precisely, that way is to fit them for fellowship in the holy community of love and goodwill. And we have to recognize that exactly because he is fitted for the holy community, the Christian is, *ipso facto,* incompletely adjusted to the secular community. The citizenship that is in heaven makes citizenship on earth not less difficult, but more. That, once more, is the significance of Jesus's phrase about "taking up the cross". It is His frank recognition of the fact that Christian community into secular is a sum that won't go, and that therefore secular community, with its steady tendency to reduce things to its own level and demand conformity to its own pattern, will always be suspicious of the claims of Christian fellowship, and in times of crisis will demand supreme loyalty to itself on pain of persecution, it may be of death. There are few untruer verses in any of the doubtful hymns we sing than that which says, "No more on us is laid the cross". In half the world to-day men are being persecuted for their Christian faith; not hundreds but thousands and tens of thousands are subject to a relentless, steady, immoral pressure in business, and the more we can sing the words with our hand on our hearts the more we convict ourselves of apostasy from a living faith and loyal life. Have we not to accept quite boldly the fact that whilst there is a major area within which co-operation is possible, our citizenship in political community may and often does involve a clash of loyalties, that it must be and cannot be other than a limited citizenship, that because our primary citizenship is in the Christian fellowship there are things which on the one hand we cannot ask from, and on the other we cannot offer to, the secular community? In the world, we can never be wholly of it, and nothing is to be gained by blurring the edges of that sharp distinction. Part of the way forward lies in making that distinction plain to John Smith.

In its socially redemptive activity the Church makes use of three methods, employs three means. As trustees of the testimony of Jesus it declares the Christian faith concerning community; as the continuing Incarnation, it should embody in its own communal life and should manifest to the world the demonstration of the Christian principles in action in a visible community; as Church militant, it sends out its individuals to reclaim the lost territory of secular community for Christ; and the way forward lies not only in the clearer recognition of the relationship of Christian community to secular, but in a sharper and more concise definition of the tasks of the Church under these three heads.

You will perhaps allow me to interject here that the Church must not allow anything to interfere with what I call the "ambulance work" of the world. We must not let people drown whilst we are draining the swamp, nor let wounded men lie on the road to Jericho untended because we are over-busy making the road safe for travellers later on. That said, let me suggest the line of action under the three heads mentioned above—the prophetic declaration of the mind of Christ concerning community, the

testimony of the individual Christian in the world of politics and affairs, the embodiment of the Christian evangel in a Christian fellowship.

And will you let me say concerning the first that I believe that the world is heartily sick and tired of the vague phrases that are current amongst us and with which we try to salve our Christian consciences, and at the same time to keep the peace with those whom we are afraid a blunter statement would hurt and offend? "Love" and "Goodwill" are terms that have become devitalized for the ordinary man, and they will never recover authority for him until we spell them out and fill them with concreter meaning. We need to say with new boldness and firmness that true community is concerned with personal and not with impersonal ends, and that it is only rightly constituted when it is founded upon and furthers right personal relationships. *It is concerned with personal ends.* We only get a true view of the community, according to the Christian point of view, when we answer one basic question: "What is happening to the men and women in it?" We take a wrong measuring rod and a fallacious standard when we ask the question in terms of things, whether those "things" are economic welfare, markets, empire, or the like. The only answer which is valid is in terms of flesh and blood, yet in terms of flesh and blood judged according to the Divine intention for it, of man regarded as a potential child of God. That is why the criterion of happiness will not serve, though it is part of the true answer. For the full and complete standard we have to take something that I call "adjustment", and the vital question is as to whether a community does or does not make for adjustment. And clearly such adjustment involves three mutually complementary relationships—adjustment to self, to community, to God. Clearly, any community which exerts a wrong ethical pressure on an individual, so that he is compelled to do the things against which his conscience protests, or which by its organization puts his existence or his welfare in jeopardy so that he becomes the prey of fear, makes almost impossible a true adjustment of the man to himself. It introduces into his life an inner cleavage, a fundamental disturbance and disharmony. In the same way a community which arbitrarily fetters him so that by reason of birth, status, or economic function he is precluded from his fair share of the wealth and life of the community, tends to create a sullen indifference, if not an actual hostility, to the community, and a determination to wrest what he feels to be his due from it, if need be by main force. Further, if community, whether by political coercion, or by the refusal of educational or cultural opportunities, denies to the individual the right to worship God with an undivided personality, "with his whole heart and mind and soul and strength", that community is unchristian.

I am not going to waste time pointing out in detail that the secular community we know, whether political or economic, does, not merely one of these things, but does them all together and does them all the time; what I am concerned to say is that when we spell out "love" in practical terms, it means a steady and unwavering insistence that human welfare is the supreme test of the community, that that implies complete equality of opportunity and self-direction cultural, economic, and political, the right to serve the community in the fullest possible measure according to one's gifts, and the relative equality of distribution of the proceeds of such service. To all these must be added liberty in the economic, political, and religious sphere, liberty which is indeed presupposed in them all, the very corner-stone of the arch. And it is time we gained the courage to say these things and to say them openly, all the more so because they are flatly contradictory of community as we know it.

Next, the Church sends its own members out into the world to witness

in it concerning the Christian faith for community. They stand four-square within the community for the things of which we have been speaking, for the re-valuation of community in terms of persons not things; for a community whose keystones are liberty, equality, and fraternity, viewed not as ends in themselves but as conditions indispensable for man's realization of his possibilities as a child of God; and for offering to God in service and worship a whole and undivided personality. And there comes the rub! How shall a man keep a conscience void of offence toward God, and yet live in a world whose standards of conduct are in violent conflict with those to which privately and personally he gives allegiance? In some cases the answer is clear. Where both the means he is asked to employ and the ends those means are designed to serve are clearly unchristian, *e.g.*, the slave traffic, the white slave traffic, and, I should add for myself, the liquor and the armament industries, or where the situation of the individual is not complicated by group-relationships, the answer is, I think, clear. A man must keep his soul at all costs. But where legitimate industry is concerned, or where the situation is complicated by group interests, *i.e.*, by the duty a man owes to his parents or his family, what then? I feel reasonably certain that even so the question as to whether he should or should not cut loose from the accursed thing should still be faced first of all, but that it should be faced *as a family*, and should not be his own individual decision. And if the family decide against the cutting loose? Then I think we have to face quite frankly the necessity of compromise, or as I prefer to put it, of toleration. I use the latter word in preference to the former because compromise suggests something static and may mean nothing more than that two selfish individuals have decided to share the swag. We need a word to suggest that the solution arrived at is not final but temporary, that the Christian individual intends to revise it at the earliest possible moment, and that it is not made for personal ends but with the larger strategy of the Kingdom of God in view; I suggest that "toleration" meets that double need most nearly. And I would venture to suggest that such an element of toleration is to be found in the practice of Jesus Himself. I find it difficult to believe that so complete a realist as Jesus was oblivious to the moral challenge of the Roman Empire, slavery, and the like. Rather do I see in it His sense that these were but the evil issues of a deeper malady and that He cut right at the root, knowing that if that could be cut, the evil fruit must wither of itself. But as a guide for own conduct in like circumstances it is instructive to note the terms on which He permitted Himself such toleration. He cut his own demands on that civilization down to a minimum, He was untiring in His counter-propaganda, and He sought to create an alternative and truer form of community. Where like circumstances obtain, the like demands are made upon us. Simplicity of life down to the point below which one's efficiency as a Christian citizen would be impaired, an untiring effort to win those in one's own group to the Christian point of view, and the deliberate fostering of the true community, the Christian fellowship, these are I suggest the minimal terms on which toleration is possible. And is there not something at least to be learned from the directness with which He singled out the crucial issue? Do not the problems of any age always come to a head in one central key problem? The problem of the early 19th century was the problem of slavery, the question as to whether human life, *qua* human, had value, and when Wilberforce established that principle in freeing the slave, he made possible all the long succession of social legislation in the latter half of the century. And is not our problem the question which are of supreme value, things or men? And does not that problem come to a head and focus in the challenge of war? And does

that not mean that our Christian witness about war has to be clear and unequivocal? Whether the conditions I have stated be the right ones upon which a Christian can engage in the work of the secular community or not, I am sure that there is no real way forward until we work out either these or alternative conditions of toleration.

There is one other thing that we must do. Within the framework of secular community during the last three-quarters of a century, there has grown up what is in reality the skeleton of a new form of community. It is no longer true to describe our community as wholly based on coercion and self-interest: something like the outline of a co-operative commonwealth has begun to take shape. Our national health services, our water supply, a good deal of our transport, our housing, in part our educational services and the like, are based upon the recognition that the good of one is the good of all, and the good of the community is the good of the individual. I think that the Church has the duty of being awake to this fact and of pointing out to its individual members the opportunities they provide for an honourable and serviceable livelihood; the Church should examine the social structure to see at what points such co-operative effort can be most successfully introduced and press for it. The principle has already been accepted, and Christians must be alert to discover the next step to be taken and hold out public service as a proper and true sphere of exercising Christian influence.

Lastly, the Christian fellowship must embody its own message. It must demonstrate in its own life the regard for human personality and the true human relations which it declares in the name of God are the only true foundations of community. What that will actually mean in practice, none can foresee. We are being driven to experiments in co-operative production and consumption in the economic sphere, and it may be that for the time we have to insulate the religious sphere from the secular, and demonstrate, within the Church as Church, the existence and possibility of true relationships of brotherliness. That at all events is the minimum demand which is being made upon us. It may be that for a time we shall have to insulate the Christian Fellowship, draw a more or less artificial ring round it, and say that within it we will demonstrate to the world how men and women ought to live together, and show that it is possible to bridge those tremendous gulfs between race, sex, class, and age which are so difficult to bridge in secular community. That, at all events, we can and must do. Yet I do not think that the Christian spirit can rest there. Its own experience of insulated fellowship will make it eager to escape from its private circle, and adventure the full strain of the tensions of the world outside. I mean by that that the fellowship experienced in worship will drive it to experiments of fellowship in the bread-and-butter business of life, in economic production and consumption.

Whether that be the direction in which the Spirit of God will lead the Church, or whether He will lead it by a way that is not yet above the horizon and not yet plain to human discernment, no man knows. All one can be certain of is that obedience to the present call will make the next step plain, and that the present call is to create within the Christian Church a true fellowship of believers. I mean by that a fellowship in which personal differences of temperament, social status, culture, upbringing, *etc.*, have been taken up into and lost in one larger loyalty and one deeper constraint of love—loyalty and love to Him Who is Saviour and Lord and the One Great Head of the Church which is His body.